

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the VERY REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., THE DEANERY, EXETER, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2.

---

Vol. XXXII

FEBRUARY, 1936

No. 188

---

## EDITORIAL

How little we supposed eight months ago, that happy day in spring, when England was bathed in sunshine, and the English people were gathered in their churches to give thanks for the King's five and twenty years of leadership and service, that "bitter constraint and sad occasion dear" would summon us again after so short a time to mark the ending of his earthly pilgrimage. The suddenness of the loss was no doubt merciful for all concerned. There were forty-eight hours of grave anxiety. Then, all through Monday, we of the public, who only knew the contents of the official bulletins, seemed to ourselves to be perpetually hearing those moving words said by the sons of the prophets to Elisha, "Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?" And more and more as the day waned we sadly felt that the only answer was, "Yea, I know it; hold ye your peace."

All death is solemn. The generations pass. Men die, and others carry on. A man remembers the death of his own father, and the sobering conviction that formed itself in him that he himself must now take his place in the front line, the firing line. Less acutely personal, but far more universally solemnizing, is the death of the King and father of us all. It implies no wrong misgivings for the future if we say that one of the old strong hopes is taken from us, one of the old strong securities is loosened. Yet there is ground for believing that the worthy tradition will be carried on. This is partly because we are sure that the man who has made himself the Friend of all the world, and the Friend of the Unemployed, will make a good king. And it is partly because King George made us aware of the happiness of his own home life. He was not only at once the leader and servant of his people, but a true husband and a loving father. He has made us all able to understand some-



thing of what is being felt by a widowed Queen and a fatherless Royal House. We all have our sorrow and our sense of loss. But there are two powerful alleviations: we can all say with a sure faith about King George, "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God," and we can all say, hopefully and happily, about his eldest son, "God save the King."

---

A country priest has sent a moving comment on a passage in our Editorial notes of last month: "Perhaps you will allow one who has been a reader of THEOLOGY from the very first number to write to you. You say, 'Priests in small country parishes sometimes get depressed. God knows, it is a hard and lonely life.' Thank you for having a thought for us country clergy. We are the poor relations of the Church. It is the first time for ages that I have seen such a sentiment in print. Its very rarity increases its value. But as you have never worked in a country village, you have but little knowledge of present-day conditions that a country priest has to face. Nevertheless, the sympathy will touch some of our hearts—it has touched mine. I am never 'lonely'; the 'hardness' I have grown used to after forty years. But I well know what 'depression' means; but I am thankful that God (in His great goodness) saves me from being depressed out of measure. But conditions are very hard. The terrible fact is that people in the country (I am speaking of my own Deanery) do not want the things of God today. Congregations get smaller and smaller. Forgive my speaking of myself. I have been well trained in a London parish, and under X., who was my dear vicar at Y. I have put in practice all that I have learned—visit, give much care to the sick and those in trouble, teach the Gospel and all that it means. But it has little effect. In my London slum days all that had much result. By such work we filled a great church with devoted people. Not so now here. It falls quite flat and makes no impression."

---

The writer continues: "There has recently grown up the practice on the part of communicants of coming to their Communion twice or thrice, or a few more times in the year, and that is all that they do in the matter of the worship of God. I do all that I can, but whatever I say it falls on deaf ears. In the old days often a good talk would put things right, but now the answer is, 'I can do what I like, can't I?'"

---

What shall we say to these things? Let us first pay a tribute of honour to the heroic men who can do what the Prophet Jeremiah did, what our Blessed Lord did on the Cross—hold on



when there is nothing visible to hold on to. Every pastor tries to make his own the Pauline words: "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of men's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." He would like to make this true of himself, but he is not commonly tried to the uttermost. It is the fact that in Corinth then the Lord had "much people in this city," and in many a parish there are some, often a considerable number, who respond generously. Of course, it is always true that the moment the priest is tempted to pride he has only to look beyond his tiny circle, and remember the vast multitudes who care nothing for his message and his gifts. But often there are some who do—enough to make him sometimes forget the others. The priest in such a parish naturally divides his time between pastoral and evangelistic work, and there is enough encouragement from the one to compensate him in his human emotions for discouragements arising from the other. It is even true that the things which encourage him in his pastoral work produce results in evangelism which have visible effect. Where there is a strong nucleus of the faithful, the outsiders will be impressed. They will think that there must be something in it. But what if there are almost none? Or if, as our brother says, you can see them getting fewer and fewer?

---

One thing that may perhaps be said is that adversity of this kind divides the men of God from those who rely on conventions, or politics, or animal spirits, or heartiness, or stunts, or any other human thing. And we still believe that the people of the parish, even if they seem to care nothing for the things of God, can recognize the man of God. A Northern Bishop tells this story: It was the Annual Parochial Church Meeting. There was a tie in the voting for People's Warden between the squire, who was on the best of terms with the Vicar, and a farmer, a man who was accustomed to make himself exceedingly "awkward." The Vicar, remembering that the Bishop had advised him in any difficulty always to choose the more self-abnegating way, gave his casting-vote for the farmer. What the squire thought is not recorded, but perhaps he also was a Christian. The effect on the farmer was not at all what the Vicar had hoped. He was just as difficult as ever all through the year. However, the next



Annual Meeting came. The farmer was again put up for election, but this time received hardly any votes. The people had said nothing, but they had observed and had drawn their own conclusions.

---

But supposing there is not even this. Then, brother, you are thrown back on God. On God pure. A priest whose outward circumstances are easier, who ministers, for example, in a cathedral which is filled by large congregations, drawn thither by motives of a general kind, owing nothing, or next to nothing, to any pastoral labours of his, is driven at times—say in Holy Week, or at Retreat, or when preparing for Confession—to ask himself: “Is this of God? Am I living, behaving, as a priest should do?” For the rest, he has many temptations to sinful pride. The brother who has no human encouragements has been selected for a far more honourable service. He has to ask himself this every day. His circumstances send him to his knees and his self-examination all the time. Otherwise he would lose heart altogether, because he has no human encouragement at all. The weapons of the Spirit are his only weapons. Is this of God? It is a most searching question. Because, mingled with the genuine pastoral desire for the good of the flock, there can be thoughts of self. As the Vicar goes upstairs to visit the man who has had the sudden accident, does he think to himself: “This is *my* chance at last. Now perhaps he will have some respect for *me*. Now I may be able to establish *my* position in this difficult family”? Sometimes the self-motive is more speciously wrapped up. Remember the three devils that Kirk’s *The Vision of God* found at so many, many points in Christian history—Formalism, Rigorism, Institutionalism. The motive may put on a chasuble, or even a black gown, or, worst of all, a top hat. It may disguise itself as a wish to maintain the proper credit of the Church, to strike a shrewd blow for Catholic custom, for the Western Use, or even the English Use. Whatever the motive, away with it, if it be not of God.

---

There are some men who, tried by this test, would fail. They have lost much of their supernatural faith. They have become rather mechanical. They are hirelings. They need what Pusey called “a solid conversion.” But very many, amid much discouragement, are true and faithful. Yet even these may have much to learn in the matter of commending their Gospel and shewing its relevance. Barry is right in his



diagnosis. What people are wondering is whether the existence and the worship of the Church are relevant. Do they supply the motive-power that we need or, at the least, might be better if we had? And it is just here that we are getting the right message from our leaders. Mr. Joad, in a Sunday paper, acknowledges that the principles of Christ may well be just what is wanted, and at the same time charges the Church with being preoccupied with trifling matters. The only one of the trifles that he mentions which lingers in our recollection is the question whether Unitarians should preach in Liverpool Cathedral, but we seem to remember that most of them were smaller things than that. The burden of his suggestion was that the energies of the Church are consumed in domestic squabbles, and meantime, it may be supposed, "the hungry sheep look up and are not fed." This is poor stuff. We ourselves, if we wanted to be censorious, could easily think of much more amusing things to say than that. But it goes well enough. It has the air of providing a rational explanation for what the lazier and more earthly instincts of *homo sapiens* always incline him to be doing. And then, simultaneously with this, the Archbishops issue their call to peace in the name of Christ, and the Archbishop of Canterbury gives his New Year B.B.C. Address on "The Right Way," two dignified, virile reminders of fundamental, eternal things. There are, of course, some serious people who believe that the Archbishop is deluded, or out of date, or unjustifiably optimistic. Their judgments must be seriously considered. But some of the comments are rather like a suggestion which we have not yet seen anywhere in so many words. What is the Church doing? Would it not be a good thing if the Bishops, or somebody, put out a few plain rules for conduct—say about ten in number? Considering their provenance, it might be conceded that four or so would be about religion of some kind, but not less than six would naturally be concerned with the facts of life. And, of course, candidates would only be required to answer six questions out of ten. Or there might be proposed some entirely fresh principle of action, that we should try, for example, to love our neighbour, or to forgive our enemy. We suggest one of these topics for Mr. Joad's next article in the *Sunday Referee*. As he would handle it, it would have all the charm of novelty. He would not be embarrassed by any confusing wealth of acquaintance with the history and literature of the subject, or with contemporary facts. Nor would his gay strictures be impeded by overmuch of that sugary sentimentality which some call generosity.

---



## SOCIOLOGY: CATHOLIC AND SECULARIST

### I

THERE are four quite different points of view, from one or another of which man observes the world of human affairs, and may come thereby to an estimate of how rightly to live our necessarily social life.

He may regard this world as fortuitous and meaningless, without rhyme or reason to it, a mad and cruel theatre in which each one of us must beat or squirm his way, as best he can, and to no purpose. The man who thinks that is quite literally unprincipled, and of necessity a moral opportunist, dangerous to society. His is the gangster mentality, and that whether he be a crude gunman or a polished gentleman exploiter. Or, secondly, one may esteem the universe as purely physical and entirely governed by mechanical law. He may regard all things that are, including himself, as composed of physical energy, helplessly organized in mathematical patterns. In that case he is what is called "a behaviourist." Such an one, if indeed he understands at all the practical implications of his own philosophy, believes that, since man has no free-will at all, choices in conduct are things impossible, and moral obligation a phrase which means, and can mean, nothing. In that case, too, he is likely to act as one irresponsible, and is almost irresistibly led to a morality of ruthlessness. The behaviourist is very likely, indeed, to become a bad behaviourist.

It should justly be observed that neither of these two attitudes is consciously taken by the vast majority of men, and that it is hard to find a thoughtful man who regards them as other than absurd. There was, to be sure, a few years ago, quite a vogue for behaviourism, especially in undergraduate circles and among others less informed; but it was soon laughed out of repute. Nothing could be more absurd than a system of thought which proclaimed that there is no such thing as thought and, therefore, that there can be no such thing as a system of thought. Even undergraduates could see the humour in that; and behaviourism, as a philosophy, began to disappear. Where one finds either a belief that all things exist by meaningless chance, or a contention that the universe, including man, is entirely obedient to abstract mathematical formulæ, a careful examination will usually reveal that what one has come across is either a pose, adopted by those who desire to appear smart,



or else an excuse philosophy advanced to justify dangerously anti-social ambitions and purposes.

The other two ways of regarding one's world are much more respectable, and have a moral and social significance. One of them is that of the secularist who sees life in terms of this world only; the other is that of the Catholic. To a comparison of these we can afford to devote some attention. The nature of sound social convictions, the basis of reasonable social hopes, and the character of workable social improvement devices alike depend upon which of these theories is true. If secularism is right, Catholicism is wrong, and *vice versa*. The two are, if not diametrically opposed to one another, at least so widely variant as to be irreconcilable. There are, to be sure, certain ameliorative activities in which Catholics and secularists can and should unite. To bind up the wounds of the bruised, to heal the sick, to feed the starving, to clothe the naked, to shelter the shelterless—these seem obviously the task of all of us. But such hospital work does not constitute a social programme of any sufficiency. To tend the victims of society is necessary; but the real problem is to create a structure that will no longer make helpless victims. Building a social order that is sound, in place of the rattle-trap thing we now have, is the real task. In caring for the victims of the present confusion, Catholics and secularists can work together as brethren, and must; but in respect to constructive policy, in labour to realize such a policy, co-operation is at present quite impossible.

An attempt on the part of Catholics to unite in a programme of social regeneration with those whose creed is secularist gets nowhere much, for the simple reason that what one deems to be a righteous order depends upon one's philosophy of life, upon one's notion of man's destiny.

What seems to the Catholic food is apt to seem to the secularist poison. This is seen to be true, for instance, in respect to such a problem as that involved in accumulation of property, beyond that necessary for use, in private hands. To the secularist, wealth seems an unmixed blessing. He deems this world's goods indispensably worth having. He wishes to make every man as rich as possible. But to the Catholic, wealth is a source of terrible danger, in that it distracts man from his true destiny, which is spiritual and other-worldly. To the Catholic, the love of money is the root of all evil; to the secularist, the love of money is what impels us toward a right social order and a true self-expressiveness. Suppose, then, this being so, that Catholics and secularists unite to advocate such taxing of estates as will make inherited wealth impossible. They may seem to be working together, but they are poles



apart. The secularist has in mind robbing the wealthy for the enrichment of the poor; the Catholic desires to emancipate the rich man from temptation too grievous to be borne. They will not pull together very long or far, we may rest assured.

Or, again, let us suppose that divorce is under discussion. The secularist, with his this-world-only philosophy, sees little or nothing in marriage but a contractual arrangement designed to make husband and wife personally happy, while the Catholic regards it rather as a means of mutual aid in a difficult creativity, an arrangement involving always, for the sake of that creativity, a severe discipline of both husband and wife, and sometimes a self-sacrifice so exacting as to be heart-breaking. To the secularist divorce seems frequently necessary and normal; to the Catholic it is a grievous sin, a crime against humanity. What possible law on divorce can satisfy them both? What policy can they possibly share in respect to marriage?

These are but illustrations of what results from an attempted co-operation in social reconstruction between those who see life from points of view too wide apart for unity.

It is imperative that the secularist define his convictions about man, his nature and destiny, and that the Catholic do likewise. From the one will come a secularist sociology, from the other a Catholic sociology. This Catholic sociology, be it remembered, will be a *scientific sociology*, not a sentimentalism. It will use, gladly, every device for measuring social behaviour that has been, or may hereafter be, discovered. It will, however, interpret the data, shared in social science by both Catholic and secularist, from the point of view of Catholic philosophy. This is exactly as legitimate a thing to do as to interpret the same data from the point of view of an anti-theistic philosophy. Data must be interpreted from *some* philosophic point of view extrinsic to the data themselves. Facts alone matter little; Truth matters more. Truth is the *meaning* of the facts. It is in regard to that meaning, not in respect to the facts themselves, that Catholic and secularist sociologists part company. And if someone still objects that "sociology is a science, and that there can no more be a specially Catholic sociology than a specially Catholic chemistry," we must answer: "Do not fool yourself by false analogies. You can measure and predict chemical action and reaction with complete accuracy, but not man's conduct. What he does depends very largely on what he is persuaded that he is. His social behaviour will always be coloured by his concept of purpose."

But, it may be asked, should we not also pay some attention to the social philosophy of a third group—namely, the Protestants? That seems a thing not easy to do. Protestant-



ism is at the moment in a state of intellectual confusion. It seems to be breaking to pieces, and the rock on which it is being wrecked is precisely the question of what are the nature and destiny of man. At least, in America—and largely elsewhere—the secularist philosophy has won the allegiance of many of the leaders of Protestantism, and of a large proportion of the rank and file thereof as well; while the rest, reacting from this, discover, somewhat to their own astonishment, that they are really Catholics, at least in theory of life. We may as well omit from serious examination “the Protestant attitude towards social problems.” There is no such thing. There are left in Protestantism today Catholic Protestants and secularist Protestants—the division goes quite across denominational lines, be it remembered—pulling in two completely opposite directions. Catholic sociology is as far as possible removed from the vague generalities of what used to be called, in Protestant circles, “the Social Gospel.” It insists, first of all, upon philosophical clarity; also, and equally, on the most scientific sort of social observation. The “Social Gospel” was usually very little more than a state of distress at social wrongs and a desire to do something about it. That far such a gospel can remain one thing; but the instant one had to become more specific, in social analysis or programme, all unity was gone from it. We may, then, confine our attention to Catholic sociology and secularist sociology. Protestant sociology is either a mixture of the two or a vacillation from one to the other.

## II

First of all, the Catholic is quite sure that there is a God, and that in no neologistic sense. There is, Catholics entirely believe, a Supreme Being, Himself absolute Truth, Beauty, Goodness, who is the maker and sustainer of all that is, ourselves included. He creates and governs everything by the outgoing of His own perfect intelligence and will. What may be His purpose in creating we cannot know, but that He *has* purpose in so doing is indubitable. If He ceased to create, if He “took His mind off it,” to use a homely phrase, the universe would cease to be. He is pure Spirit, spaceless, timeless; but His creation is conditioned by both space and time. He exists in Himself; all else exists because He wills it into being. For man to know Him, for man to love Him and be loved by Him, for man to love also the brethren because God loves them, for man to share with God, as He graciously permits, God’s own creative activity, knowing something of the joy of making things, of thinking things, of perceiving at least a little of



meaning—that is for man to arrive at significance and to have the only abiding happiness. If one misses these things, he misses everything. Of that the Catholic is entirely convinced.

Any social philosophy, therefore, that ignores that primary purpose of man's existence and substitutes for it some lesser good, some accidental joy, no matter how speciously attractive, is to a Catholic intolerable. Such a social philosophy, he is sure, only fools the citizens. Under its domination they waste their lives—not only a major tragedy, but the only unalloyed tragedy. Secularism, in the eyes of the Catholic, "sells humanity down the river" into a heart-rending slavery, to endure a cosmic cruelty. The secularist masters may be kind. There may be much fun and laughter on the plantation and easy labour; but such a living is slavery just the same, in which freemen of God are deprived of their birthright.

The secularist, on the other hand, does not see men and women as immortal souls, whose chief end is to know God and enjoy Him for ever. He regards man as little, if anything, other than a more developed, more intelligent, more subtle kind of animal. Though he may talk about "human values," he is of the opinion that what material goods and physical pleasures may here on earth be procured are the things that matter most. With a deep intensity and, let us suppose, with a complete honesty he believes that man is nothing more than of this world; and he tries to steer accordingly his own life and the life of the community. The Catholic says that there would be small harm in the secularist contention that we are animals (every Catholic knows that, as far as his body goes, he is akin to the beasts) were it not that the secularist ignores things about man which seem to the Catholic inexplicable in animal terms. To the Catholic eye the secularist seems a man who sincerely seeks happiness for himself (if selfish) or for all men (if altruistic); but who makes the mistake of supposing that physical things, if obtained in sufficient abundance, are enough to satisfy. He thinks and labours in terms of food, drink, sleep, applause, good-fellowship, amateness, being amused, and letting himself go, which last, if he be literary or a progressive educationalist, he calls "self-expression." He is here today, he believes, and gone tomorrow; and so, he is persuaded, is everyone round about him. "Get the most out of the passing moment," he advises, "here and now, in terms of the physical this and that." Such is the philosophy about man held alike both by the self-centred, sybaritic secularist and also by the benevolent secularist with desire to help his brother-man. The heedless pleasure-seeker and the earnest Bolshevik idealist differ in much; but in what matters most they are brothers.



Both of them seem to the Catholic to miss the point of living; and for both of them he has a deep, abiding pity. He prays for both alike, that they may be converted from ruinous engrossment in a secondary world, the world of Time and Space. For what shall it profit a man, he asks, or a society of men, to gain the whole world if they lose all that really matters? A Catholic sociology is bound to make God's will primary, and to see as a right society only one wherein the sons of man put first things first.

### III

In the second place, the Catholic believes that natural man is himself a part, and an imperfect part, of God's yet incomplete creation. As such, no human being is much to be trusted, either by others or by himself. He is the highest product in the natural world, the best result as yet of God's slow and gradual moulding of inert matter; but he is not by nature a perfect product, or one naturally self-perfectible.

I am moved here to quote a passage written by a distinguished American layman.\* It seems worth repeating, so well does it state the Catholic teaching about man. He says: "The natural world, considered apart from God, is without form and void. Upon this undifferentiated chaos the Spirit of God moves, splitting it with differences and distinctions, and uniting these into new and ever higher sorts of relatedness, always toward the pattern eternally existing in His mind. The creative task is not easy, even for God. Not that matter is hostile to Him; it is merely unresponsive, hard, recalcitrant and dumb. God works in it as a sculptor who moulds, not fluid plaster, but stiff and intractable clay. It delays His purpose, not by any power or counter-purpose of its own, but by the dead-weight of its inertia. Little by little there comes to appear an element not quite predictable. It is as if the clay, reluctant at first, had become more and more pliable under the hand of the Sculptor. At last comes man, a being that has purpose and a goal, that can reason, love, strive, and worship; a being that senses an *ought* in conduct. He is not wholly clay. He partakes of the qualities of some entirely 'other' order of existence. At last the Eternal Sculptor has fashioned, in the dull, dead clay of matter, one with whom He can speak as Father to son. Now God can enlist the creature to have part in creation. Yet we are fashioned in clay, after all. In us the clay and the Potter are met, and our lives are a battleground. Made to have converse with God, we yet have seven devils within us. It was for this that St. Paul cried out: 'O miserable man

\* Charles L. Dibble in *Christ the King*, Harper and Bros., 1936.



that I am! Who shall deliver me from this body of death?"

It seems an extraordinary paragraph, and what it says is significant for those who would understand the Catholic approach to sociology. It presents with great clarity the Catholic conviction that man is a creature at once glorious and untrustworthy, torn two ways by that of which he is made and by Him who is making him. The existence of that conflict between spirit and matter is the reality behind what Catholics call "the fall of man." It is not *de fide* that one Adam, a literal and specific person, was made perfectly good and then disobeyed God. Adam is the type-man. In every one of us, when we begin to be, is that which is like God and for God. "Yet we are fashioned in clay, after all." That which we would, we do not. We are by nature too weak to fulfil our destiny. We sink back into that out of which we were made. That is the fall of man! If there is to be completion in us of the handiwork of God, the Catholic maintains, God has more to do than to place us here in nature and leave us alone to struggle with problems too great for us. He has made us; but we must be remade, further made, if we are to be humanly effective. "Unless a man be born *again*, he cannot see the Kingdom." So said Jesus to a man named Nicodemus. The Catholic is sure that it is even so. Man must be redeemed from failure, given a supernatural sufficiency. Any sociology which overlooks this fact ignores what Catholics insist must not be ignored.

For men and for their salvation—this is the Catholic faith—God becomes incarnate, lives in humanity the life of perfectness, dies a death of creative love that all mankind may live—the clay at last completely plastic in the Potter's hands—and thenceforth gives to men the necessary power and authority to become indeed the sons of God, rewarding faith in Him by Grace poured out in unity of the divine and the human, and in the sacraments thereof. So may the race at last advance *in Him*, with stumbling steps, but not alone or unaided, toward the measure of the stature of His own fullness. So may men live more and more the eternal life, here and hereafter; not by nature, be it remembered, but by super-nature.

#### IV

There are, in all this Catholic teaching, three things to be noted as of sociological significance: first that natural man is regarded as impotent to make for himself a social life, or any other kind of life, that is humanly satisfactory; secondly, that the moral growth required for the formation and preservation



of an adequate and secure human society is looked on as dependent upon the operation in men and women of supernatural Grace; and thirdly, that it is assumed that virtue is not a thing which can be passed down from father to son by natural procreative process—not “an acquired characteristic,” to use biological language, that each generation must be saved anew. If these things be so, there can be—as in fact the Catholic insists that history shews there is—no such thing as an automatic, evolutionary progress toward better human living or toward a permanently righteous social order.

It is here, perhaps, more than anywhere else, that the Catholic finds himself most completely scorned by the secularist; for the secularists do believe, with a faith as fanatical as is the contrary belief of Catholics, that man is sufficient in himself, that goodness is inheritable, that there is a gradual development into rightness of life. He is confident that there are, therefore, an automatic moral progress and a progressively emerging social competence. He risks all he has and is on that hope; and Catholics are mighty sorry to see him do it. He seems to them to be backing not so much a losing horse as an entirely imaginary horse.

When the secularist, to change the metaphor, talks about the Paradise he proposes to build without God's grace—now or next year, in America or in Russia or in Ruritania—Catholics are not vastly interested. They know only too well, or think they do, what natural man is like. The life of natural man, they are sure, is exactly what that old seventeenth-century political philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, said it was—“solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” Of course, poor Hobbes, who was himself a secularist, was sure that all natural man needs to do to escape from such a lamentable existence is to make a social contract that involves the surrender of all liberty, exalt some human being as absolute sovereign, and then obey without question; but while his remedy seems to Catholics vicious, his diagnosis appears to them to be correct. It is only by constant struggle and deliberate asceticism and by the grace of God, they maintain, that man ever rises, as he does sometimes rise, from such a sad estate as is natural to something more human; and back to that pitiable state of nature he soon subsides, by way of war and greed and lust and foolishness, whenever he ceases to lift his feeble hands to God for succour.

All this does not seem to Catholic observers to be mere theory. They say something like this: “The facts which prove it are written so plainly that even a wayfaring man may read, written in the book of the past, in the story of human behaviour, in the annals of society. The idea of a self-sufficient, morally



evolving man is derived not in the least from science, nor at all from observation of man's conduct past or present. Both psychology and history combine to furnish an overwhelming array of evidence against such an idea, and none in favour of it. It is a notion born of human conceit. In its usual contemporary form it stems back to Jean Jacques Rousseau, of whom the Archbishop of York has justly said that he was 'the most confused and the most pernicious of all writers on politics.'

"Rousseau had a strange belief in man," the Catholic goes on, "derived not from observation so much as from wishful thinking. According to him, man is naturally good and sufficiently able; he can save himself and bring in a perfect society by common sense. He wants neither redemption nor grace. All he needs is an education designed to release him freely to express his noble inner self, plus a little clever social planning such as he is entirely competent to conceive and bring to pass. These ideas have been welcomed by a modern world filled less with knowledge of humanity than with conceit. Rousseau is today echoed enthusiastically up and down every land. Almost everybody except the Catholic has come to believe, almost as a matter of course, in Rousseau's alleged wisdom. Most modern Utopias, all the way from those of the capitalistic individualist to those of Marx and Lenin and Hitler and Mussolini, are based on Rousseau's presuppositions about man. It is not to be wondered at that the Catholic, who knows how false those presuppositions are, should have no great faith in such Utopias.

"The world has been going its way," the Catholic concludes his argument, "man trusting in himself, for a good while now. What price the millennium nowadays? But fond delusion dies a slow and difficult death. The humanistic Utopia-mongers still cry their wares. Marxians, Fascists, Leninists, New-Dealers, the champions of Normalcy, all keep crying to us: 'Wait. Trust us. Man is competent if only we can lead him. We, at least, are competent. This way to Paradise!' And all the while the social machine keeps slowing down, we starve in the midst of plenty, law gives way to licence, honour flees the camp, silliness the more stridently shouts its banal insults to human dignity, and hell laughs joyously at the thought of the tabernacle of the spirit soon to be reduced to bloody carrion stinking to the heavens. Delusion does indeed die hard, but die it will and must."

Catholics have, then, no faith whatever in natural man, or in a natural heaven to be made here on earth by man's unaided wisdom and ability.



Enthusiastic secularists become highly indignant because Catholics assure them that the amiable idea of natural progress toward social perfection is ridiculous; that man must be interfered with by a power outside and above himself; that he must be willing so to be interfered with, if he is to avoid a relapse into barbarism. Catholics do not deny that there has been from time to time occasional moral improvement; but such improvement, they explain, is always due to discipline of natural impulses for the sake of supernatural ends; and, moreover, they are sure that the improvement never lasts much longer than the spiritual regimen that gave it birth.

All the cheerful progressive hope of man lifting himself by natural wisdom to a social peace and righteousness; all confidence that man can get where he would be by pulling on his own boot-straps; all trusting that our great-grandchildren will, by virtue of mere lapse of time, become better and better boot-strap pullers, comes to grief, according to Catholic assumption, on the rock of man's helpless selfishness and stupidity. It is human nature that must be changed. It can be changed, but not self-changed. God's grace alone can change it, and that only when man is willing that God's grace should change it. To the Catholic that is axiomatic. The secularist, who at present rules the world, perceives it not at all. Because to his mind the secularist fails to understand the simple truth about man's inability, the Catholic cannot join in pushing secularist projects for the salvation of society. Even such projects as are in themselves undoubtedly righteous, such, for instance, as the Kellogg-Briand pact or the League of Nations, come to nothing, says the Catholic, when they are in secularist hands. The secularist is not radical enough, in the literal meaning of the word, to suit the Catholic. He does not seem to go to the root of things. At the root of every human problem, every social problem, is the wickedness and weakness, the spiritual and social incompetence of the once-born man. No Catholic for a moment thinks otherwise.

We may note here a few wise words, entirely typical of Catholic sociological scholarship, written by that learned and self-forgetful friar, Father A. G. Hebert, of the Kelham community, in an indispensable book, published this last autumn, entitled *Liturgy and Society*.<sup>\*</sup> He says:

"There is no false optimism about human nature in the Gospels. Throughout the story the Messiah is represented as in conflict with radical evil. . . . Therefore all schemes for an ideal social order which rest on a fundamental optimism with regard to human nature, an assumption that man is able

<sup>\*</sup> Faber and Faber, London, 1935.



to achieve his own salvation, and a failure to reckon with the radical evil in man, are fantasies out of relation with the real facts of life. . . . The Church may not identify any such social or political programme with the cause of God. . . . The deepest contribution which the Church can make to society must spring out of her life as the Church of God. . . . We have as much need as Israel of old to listen to the voice of the prophet; only, be it remembered, in giving his social message the prophet is reminding Christians of the corollaries of the Incarnation."

Of the corollaries of the Incarnation, of Redemption, of Grace, the secularist world knows next to nothing, nor cares for them at all. Its social hopes are built on faith in the good will, the honour, the ability of the natural man. The Catholic social scholar points out that it is these very things that give way before our eyes as man feels the strain of modern life. Man begins to suspect his own failure. He approaches panic, and with that panic the decay of the qualities upon which the secularist relies becomes all the more rapid. The secularist is forced to put his trust, politically, either in democracies composed of this-world-minded commoners, each seeking the best possible advantage for himself, or, when these ruin society by their selfish scramble, in dictators of one sort or another. The Psalmist knew better. He put not his trust in princes nor in the sons of men generally. Neither does the Catholic. The Catholic puts his trust in God, and in people only to the extent that they are God-minded. In the future, he is persuaded, as over and over again in the past, when secularism has reduced society to chaos, God, working through and in His grace-fed sons and daughters, must redeem and rebuild. It is for that day, and with no great hope for the immediate future, that the modern Catholic seeks to develop a true sociology, one in accord with the changeless faith of the Incarnate Son of God.

The Catholic sociologist is usually very humble about *his own* ability to save the world. He, too, is a failing man, and weak. He does not see the way out of all our troubles. He knows well enough that the social problem is so complicated that it can be solved only as we go along—*solvitur ambulando*; but he is sure that nothing will ever be solved if they who walk remain mere natural men, unredeemed by God, ignorant and selfish, animals only. The Catholic's one immediate and indispensable demand upon society, therefore, is that he shall continue to have the right to worship Jesus and be fed by Him and follow Him as best he can. For freedom to do that the Catholic will gladly pay any price, if need be the price of martyrdom. He perceives the centrality for right living of



St. Paul's warning: "Be ye not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." The Catholic sociologist, unconformed and transformed, tries his best to see the world and its difficulties with the eye of God. He pities it, and loves its people and prays for them, and is prepared, if he sees how to do it, to live and die for them; but he does not believe in the world's power of self-redemption; he does not for a moment expect that a world that is pagan will bring in the Kingdom of God. Between him and the secularist may lie a struggle for the future of society. The Catholic sociologist, however, is not preparing for any battle with his secularist brother. The Catholic sociologist is quite content to wait. Rightly or wrongly, he is convinced that the facts are on his side.

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL.

---

---

## THE CURE OF SOULS

"*Il nous fait toucher Dieu,*" said Cardinal Mercier of his confessor.

It is one of the tragedies of the Church of England that in the realm of theology she has been greatly interested in the systematic aspect, but has treated with scant regard both moral and mystical theology. The Roman Church has been much wiser, and has never lost sight of the different branches of theology, and she has ever required of her priests that they should be adequately schooled in the complete art of their most holy calling, and such implies a working knowledge of dogmatic, mystical, moral, and ascetic theology. Whatever the critic of the Roman Church may say, honesty demands that he should admit that her priests perform their sacerdotal duties according to the Roman idea with conspicuous success and helpfulness, and this can only be attributed to their meticulous training and preparation.

This emphasis on theology and the priest's tireless efforts to teach such to his people explains why the devotional life of Roman devotees is infinitely deeper than that of any other community, even though some of the practices and cults of the saints may tend to be imprudent and unhistorical. The amazing number of Roman Catholic books on prayer, meditation, mysticism, retreat, and spiritual exercises shews that the supply is met by the demand. Essays, letters, and treatises by and of the Saints are read, marked, learned, and inwardly digested, and they reveal the profound interest taken by her



children in the devotional works of spiritual masters in the Roman Church. A cursory glance at the General Catalogue (1935) of books published by Burns Oates and Washbourne will bear evidence to the quantity and quality of devotional literature read by the faithful of the Roman Church, and, from the Anglican point of view, will make sad contrast with the works published by the leading publishing houses of the Church of England, such as Mowbray or S.P.C.K.,\* even though in the last twenty years both these latter firms have printed more devotional works than at any other period of their history. There can be but one explanation for this striking contrast in the world of books between Rome and Canterbury—namely, that one delights to steep herself in the Church's sacred prayer-life, and that the other is far less inclined to do so, and prefers to develop spirituality along independent lines. So there is a modicum of biting truth in a Benedictine father's recent remark that "Catholics affirm *orare est laborare* but non-Catholics *laborare est orare*." It must be admitted that in the unredeemed English temperament and mentality there is something which makes it exalt the practical Martha at the expense of the devotional Mary, though it was the latter who received her Lord's approbation and also His assurance that that good part which she had chosen to develop would neither in this world nor the next be taken from her.

Now this emphasis on action may account for the extraordinary difference which is so clearly seen in the ways in which the Church of Rome and the Church of England train their priests. The normal period of training for a deacon as proposed by the Bishops of the Anglican community is three years at a university, during which the student may read for any degree on any subject he likes, and then two years or less—generally less by a term or half a term, due to the date of the ordination—at a theological college in which one is expected to pass the General Ordination Examination. Even in this examination one may be excused Latin or Greek, though such is called "an exceptionable case." At the moment there is an increasing number of ordination candidates coming forward who omit altogether the required three years at a university, plus the two years at a theological college, and instead spend three years at a theological college, and this consists of all their theological preparation for the ministry. What is worse, one or two of the theological colleges which specialize in the three years' training are definitely partisan in relation to churchmanship. A revival of a more intense preparation, based on the

\* The Faith Press alone, amongst our publishing firms, seeks to remedy this distressing scarcity of devotional literature, but it has produced few, if any, classics.



Roman method, covering a period of five to seven years, is carried out at Kelham and Mirfield, but this is a comparatively recent innovation.

In the Roman Church the minimum of time in preparation for the diaconate is seven years, save in *very* exceptionable cases, and who would be so rash as to say that the General Ordination Examination was harder and required a higher standard than the many equivalent tests in the preparation of the Roman Church? The present writer was recently conversing with an ex-Anglican priest who had been studying at the Beda College in Rome with a view to ordination in the Roman Church, and he asserted that the course there demanded considerably more learning and scholarship than he had had, and this man had taken a "first" in theology at an English university and had found his General Ordination Examination mere child's play!

The pathetic ill-equipment of her ministers is a fact which no serious member of the Church of England can possibly overlook, and that the consequences have not been more disastrous to the present life of the Church one can only be thankful for, though at the same time surprised; but in relation to the future life of the Church one may well be very anxious and alarmed. The rapid spread of knowledge and the number of men and women now entering all the various universities no longer allow the parson to be the only "scholar" (*sic*) in the parish, and if he is even to keep abreast of the best brains in his congregation, let alone be ahead of them, he must read and study with ceaseless vigilance. He will need not merely to have read, but to *know* the works of such theologians and philosophers as W. R. Inge, B. H. Streeter, W. R. Matthews, A. E. J. Rawlinson, N. P. Williams, K. E. Kirk, A. E. Taylor, etc. Such Romanists as Fathers D'Arcy, Garrigou-Lagrange, and Grandmaison, M. Saudreau, Dom Lehodey, Jacques Maritain, Henri Bremond, etc., cannot be omitted in one's reading; nor should one ignore such writers as Bertrand Russell, A. N. Whitehead, Eddington, the psychologists Freud, Jung, Adler, Janet, and the Behaviourist school in America. Again, one must pay attention to the writers of the Humanist school, such as Walter Lippmann, Julian Huxley, and John Dietrich, etc. In addition to all these writers, one dare not omit to study the elements of economics and eugenics when now they are such "live" subjects. Bernard Shaw is also an annoying necessity for reading.

All this will seem to many of the clergy a burden grievous to be borne, and the reason for such is that they are untrained and do not know the discipline without which there can be no true studying, and yet neither priest nor people would deny



the present need for intellectual leaders and for the Church to be a *teaching* Church. Bampton lectures are not required in the pulpit, though they might be "potted" and simplified and the kernel of their lesson given to the hungry minds of men and women. Except in some rural parishes of small dimensions and distant from a large town or city, most modern minds are hungry for Truth, and often through lack of sound teaching from the priests are compelled to seek it *extra ecclesia*. Except on occasions, gone for all time is the emotional discourse with its tonic effect for the encouragement of good living, and now with men and women pining for clear instruction in the Faith and its implications, preaching has become a much sterner affair and demands greater ability, knowledge, and sympathy. Of course, these people would not admit that they were anxious for dogma; they would say that they were uninterested in theology, and that they only wanted to know what was the good life and how one might live it. In reply, the wise priest would have to inform them that to know the *summum bonum* and how to achieve it necessitated Christian theology and philosophy if explanation were to be given.

No one who walks the world with eyes and ears open can fail to discern the disillusionment of the present age, in which old values are being expelled for new, tradition is being questioned at the bar of reason, and everything appears to be in a state of flux. Amid all this instability and confusion, many are seeking for Truth—that unfailing reality which is above and beyond Time, and which must remain identical through all ages, the same yesterday, today, and for ever, though man's grasp of it may vary. Frightened lest life should have no meaning and no ultimate reality, people are desperately seeking for such, and specially is this true of the younger generation, who long not to believe that the bottom has now fallen out of the universe. As Henry Seidle Canby reminds us, some of the young have seen the world as a worthless place. At seven they saw through their parents, and disobeyed them. At fourteen they saw through education, and avoided it. At eighteen they saw through morality, and went beyond it. At twenty-one they saw through the social system, and sneered at it. And at twenty-three they are lost, having seen through everything, and are left without anything further to see.

Disillusionment and futility are the signs of this unsettled age. In the great world-darkness people are seeking for the light, but the darkness threatens to overcome it. They feel themselves alone and lost without a star to guide them. Noel Coward, who well understands this post-war world, has lyrically explained the bankruptcy of hope and idealism in which men



and women find themselves as they exist amid the cacophonies and complexities of a massive mechanical city existence:

Only one among millions, Life's a sad routine,  
Striving for a goal that hasn't a meaning.  
Lonely, living in a shadow, part of a machine.  
Rising from despair the buildings are leaning,  
Nearer, nearer each day, pressing Life away.

Day in, day out,  
Life will be soon over and done. Where has it led, and why?  
Day in, day out,  
Where is the moon? Where is the sun? Where is the open sky?  
Ever seeking, and believing. Where is hope for us all?  
Sirens shrieking, Progress wearing poor Humanity's pall.  
Iron, rot; steel, rust,  
Speed, noise, death, dust.  
Why should we work? Why should we live? Why  
Even die?\*

Surely no true priest can remain immobile and satisfied when he sees mankind, having struck its tents, on the move, and yet not knowing whither it goes; and if he believes that Christ is *Lux Mundi* and the Church the *Corpus Christi*, he must strain himself to win the souls and minds of men and women, and when he tries to make that effort, then he will be confronted with his own sheer incompetency to grapple with the living problem which these folk constitute. He will come face to face with his own ignorance, and if he should try to improve, he will be in that position which Canon Bezzant described in his paper on "The Training of the Clergy" at the Modern Churchman's Union Annual Conference (1935): "With no opportunities and no habits of reading, and little skill in the art of reading wisely and profitably, and sometimes criticized as not doing their job if they manifest any such tendencies, their mental efforts are confined to preparing sermons and addresses which may satisfy or weary or annoy the faithful, but which are seldom more than declarations of personal or other people's convictions, neither explained nor defended in a way likely to convince anyone who does not already share them. . . . It is this situation which makes the outlook for the future as serious as the remedy, for it is obvious. Christianity as a religion maintained and taught by an institution is clearly neither wholly a life nor wholly a doctrine, but both: it is a life largely determined by and built upon a doctrine. In the modern world it is imperative that priests of the Christian Church should be able to expound and defend the Christian philosophy of life, its grounds, and the conduct proper to it, against the many theories and indifferences which challenge it" (*The Modern Churchman*, October, 1935).

\* *Collected Sketches and Lyrics*, pp. 284-285.



Further, the clergy must possess a clear technique if they are capably to deal with the personal problems of people's lives. Intellectual difficulties can only be treated by intellect if they are to be solved, and likewise moral difficulties require most delicate massage at the hands of moral and ascetic theology as employed by the priests if they are to be clarified. *The Church of England has no definite moral theology*, and if her priests seek to prepare themselves for hearing confessions, they must either rely on sanctified common sense or resort to helpful works by Romans on the subject, such as *A Manual of Moral Theology*, by Fr. Slater, S.J., or *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, by H. Davis. There is hardly one first-class book written by an Anglican priest for Anglican priests on the subject of confessions and its kindred subjects.\* Some books written by Dr. Kirk will be found invaluable, but these are not so direct or comprehensive as the two large works mentioned above.† F. G. Belton's *A Manual for Confessors* has much good in it, but it is not the type of book which would be agreeable to all Anglicans. F. P. Harton's careful and brilliant work, *The Elements of the Spiritual Life*, is the one classic of recent years dealing with the interior life.

Is it any wonder, then, that with no training whatsoever—save preparation for one three-hour paper on Christian Morals in the General Ordination Examination—in moral theology, and with a great scarcity of Anglican books on this subject, our priests are in danger of being lamentable failures when subtle problems of personal life are encountered and brought to them for elucidation and solution?

As the modern world silently appeals for clear instruction, so, too, it is asking how it may be delivered from the many neuroses to which it is in thrall. Psychology is felt to be the science which is the key to the hidden rooms of man's life and character, and if only it can be utilized, then man will be well rid of the numerous phobias and complexes which molest his life and drive from it all tranquillity and security. If the Christian *Pax Dei* is not an empty phrase or platitude, it means that when the human will has been set on God, and when man has made his peace with himself and with God, from that moment the serenity and assurance of being in a rightful state of harmony will come to a man from God, and he will be able to weather the inevitable storms which blow across all lives. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee."

\* This was written before the publication of a book which from its title should prove very helpful, *The Theory and Practice of Penance*, ed. H. E. Box (S.P.C.K.).

† *Some Principles of Moral Theology; Ignorance, Faith, and Conformity; Conscience and its Problems; The Vision of God.*



But how many priests are alert to the psychology of sin and appreciate the devastating power of temptation? Sin readily committed will corrupt a man's nature, but temptation erroneously withstood and repressed will set up undercurrents of fear and weakness within a man of which he has no knowledge. When his health becomes impaired he will speak of "liver trouble" and of "being run down," but true as these may be, they are not the correct diagnoses, being only effects of a far deeper cause. Those who knew D. H. Lawrence, with his violent loves and hates, his endless seekings for something which he did not know and could never find, his irascible temper and supreme sensitiveness, will be aware that he was not a genius gone mad nor an artist unable to express himself, but that he was, *unknown to himself*, a sex-obsessed man, and that his whole life, physical, mental, and spiritual, was an unconscious battle with the power of the flesh, which in him was passionate, urgent, and proved finally omnipotent. Only one thing could have saved Lawrence—this "son of woman," as Middleton Murry aptly calls him—and that was the redemption of his whole manhood. Such, and such alone, could have brought him the *Pax Dei*, and could have made him feel that he was unified with the world and its Creator, instead of feeling himself to be an eccentric above and beyond the ways of all people, or a rebel hounded from place to place by a ruthless society. "To win true peace a man must feel himself directed, pardoned, and sustained by a supreme power; to feel himself on the right road, at the point where God would have him be, in order with God and the universe."\*

In every parish there are lesser Lawrences, hindered and broken by the weight of the burdens and sins which they carry. Only the solution *in religion* can save them from the overcrushing nature of these problem-loads, but the difficulty is that most of these people are not aware what their burdens are, nor to whom to turn for a prudent diagnosis of their ill-condition. Some may find relief through psycho-analysis, but it will provide them with no future dynamic to save them from once more coming to this place of torment. What they need is the cure of their souls through the ministration of the Church, and in some form or other confession (the unloading of the burden), absolution (the assurance that the burden is unloaded), and penance (the reminder of the old load and how it can be prevented from appearing once more), but it may be an intricate process to bring them to the realization of this need. And, again, we must ask how many priests are competent of helping them towards this realization? Few, because they have not

\* H. F. Amiel, *Intimate Journal*, p. 128.



troubled to learn the rudiments of normal and abnormal psychology, though without such knowledge one cannot deal with problem-lives and save them from self-massacre. The good priest must be an ambulance man to his people, able not only to care for them, but also to cure them of mental maladies, which are in the last analysis spiritual disharmonies. If he cannot cope with the shattered nerves and spirits of the modern world, the priest will be left to serve only a little coterie of faithful people, and the great mass of humanity will go sliding down the slope of a difficult world into the sea of destruction, with the devils of fear and worry raging within, as once did the Gadarene swine in the Gospel story. "The work of the parson is, in many respects, leaving him. There are things which he used to do for the people; he does not do them now; the State does them instead, or the local authority. This care of souls is slowly passing, too; the psychologist, religious or not, is doing it more and more. Are we going to let it go?"\*

To sum up, there are three necessities for a revival of the Faith and its practice among members of the Anglican Church, and each requires the co-operation of priest and people.

(a) *An increase in deep devotion.* Amid a welter of plans for social transformation and world peace, it must be insisted that this world is not an end in itself, but a means to the end, and that end is the Vision of God. As the Bishop of Southwark has recently written: "We are in danger of forgetting that Christianity is something more than philanthropy; although it cannot be truly Christian without that love of neighbours which finds expression in personal kindness and social service, it is more than that. Fundamentally it is a relationship to God revealed in Christ as active love, and it issues in a life lived in thankful response to that love, which is our salvation." What is needed today is a renewed emphasis on *supernatural* Christianity, and this will lead to the desire for more acquaintance with prayer, meditation, contemplation, and their complements—asceticism, self-abandonment, and the desire for union with the Divine. Modern man, even modern Christians, must be rescued from becoming too geocentric, and this can only be done by stressing the other world of eternity. Man must be taught to seek and love the City of God and not the city of man. "Two loves, therefore, have given origin to these two cities—self-love, in contempt of God, unto the earthly city; love of God, in contempt of oneself, unto the heavenly city. The first seeks the glory of man, and the latter desires only God."† If man can come to desire only God, then devotion

\* T. W. Pym, *Our Personal Ministry*, p. 33.

† St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, xiv. 28.



will grow within him, and he will recover the sense of "the Holy," and also what Karl Barth calls "the lost wonder of God."

(b) *An increase in sound Christian teaching.* When knowledge is vast and wide, it is essential that such should be synthesized and co-ordinated, and this can only be achieved when the Christian Faith is seen as the mother of all Truth, and when science and philosophy as her legitimate children are attached to her from whom actually they took their origin in distant years. Perhaps the modern world needs a new *Summa Theologica*. No longer must there be contentment with a vague "creedless Christianity," but instead a vivid representation of the eternal facts of the ageless Gospel which may be understood in the language of the modern world, so that every man may hear them spoken in his own tongue in which he was born.

(c) *An increase in psychological knowledge.* The practice of faith-healing as performed by our Lord was *usually* mental and spiritual, and this work the Church should have been doing all down the centuries, instead of allowing others to try and do it. The actual healing of organic diseases—*e.g.*, cancer, consumption, broken limbs—is *not* the work of the Church herself, but of her other ministers in the doctor's profession. But the healing of diseased minds and spirits is very definitely her work, and such cannot be accomplished unless her ministers are proficient in this art, and proficiency will demand sound psychological knowledge and acquaintance with psycho-therapeutic methods as well as with moral theology.

The cure of souls is an awful charge if properly fulfilled, and a man may well shrink from it in natural humility. But those who have heard the Divine summons and have yielded themselves to the privileged obligations of the priesthood have now the imperative duty placed upon them of making themselves the best that they can be, so that not even one little one may be caused to stumble through their neglect and ignorance. Nor will the priests forget those solemn vows which they made before the Bishop in answer to his responsible questions at their sacred Ordination:

"Will you, then, give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same?"  
*I will do so, by the help of the Lord.*

"Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines?" *I will, the Lord being my helper.*

"Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the



Holy Scripture, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh ?" *I will endeavour myself so to do, the Lord being my helper.*

If a priest sincerely and energetically makes such endeavours, though they will involve much labour, he will eventually see some of the seeds which he has sown bringing forth fruit, if not a hundredfold, perhaps sixtyfold. He will have assisted in the great task of unravelling the many twisted skeins within his people's minds, and will have made of them one golden thread of pure wisdom and consecrated action. He will have inculcated in their hearts a fervent love for God and an overwhelming desire to gain only the pearl of great price, which is the Beatific Vision. He will have removed secret tensions and conflicts which have been tormenting and lacerating their minds, and will instead have brought them to the peace of God. In return the people will have come to see in him a true shepherd of his flock, and with confidence they will recommend others to go to him for advice, knowing that they themselves had been helped and directed aright.

The cure of souls is a precious duty, demanding excessive sagacity, tenderness and sympathy. It involves teaching a man self-knowledge as well as God-knowledge, because unless he has learned through honest and non-morbid introspection to see himself as he truly is without the veneer which etiquette and artificiality impose, he cannot see God. If a man knows not himself whom he can see, how can he know God whom he has not seen ? With the utmost care and gentleness the priest must deal with the souls of men and women so that he may bring them to eternal life, which is but a name for a life in harmony with God. By degrees he will see through his wise efforts, assisted by the sanctifying grace of God, ugliness of nature being reborn into beauty of character, inherent weakness being replaced by adopted virtue, mortal man being clothed in Divine immortality. Let St. Teresa, in her lovely parable about "The Mystic Butterfly," reveal this wonderful transfiguration which can come to any man or woman through the power of God and the medium of His Church:

"You have heard how wonderfully silk is made—in a way such as God alone could plan—how it all comes from an egg resembling a tiny peppercorn. When, in the warm weather, the mulberry trees come into leaf, the little egg, which was lifeless before its food was ready, begins to live. The caterpillar nourishes itself upon the mulberry leaves until, when it has grown large, people place near it small twigs upon which, of its own accord, it spins silk from its tiny mouth until it has made a narrow little cocoon in which it buries itself. Then this



large and ugly worm leaves the cocoon as a lovely little white butterfly. . . .

"The silkworm symbolizes the soul, which begins to live when, kindled by the Holy Spirit, it commences using the ordinary aids given by God to all, and applies the remedies left by Him in His Church. Then it comes to life and continues nourishing itself upon this food and on devout meditation until it has reached full vigour. When the silkworm is full grown it begins to spin silk and to build the house wherein it must die. By this house, when speaking of the soul, I mean Christ. Die! Die as the silkworm does when it has fulfilled the office of its creation, and you will see God and be immersed in His goodness, as the little silkworm is enveloped in its cocoon. As soon as, by means of this prayer, the soul has become entirely dead to the world, it comes forth like a lovely little white butterfly! Oh, how great God is!"

PATRICK COWLEY.

## NOTES ON THE PRACTICE OF SPIRITUAL COMMUNION

It is to be wished that some competent theologian would systematically work out for us the theory and implications of Spiritual Communion as part of a larger work on sacramental and non-sacramental means of grace. But some sort of thin rough sketch of the practice, for practical purposes, may be useful to ordinary unlearned plain Church-people.

In the Orthodox Church, according to the Great Archimandrite Constantinides, "the doctrine and practice of the Spiritual Communion is not known"; and, as another Orthodox theologian says: "The word itself is not, and I hope never will be used."

In the West, St. Augustine's great saying, *Crede et manducasti*,\* seems to have been the seed of subsequent development. The saying has sometimes been overpressed; for it does not refer directly and immediately to Eucharistic Communion, but, coming at the very beginning of the great discourses (John vi., 28, 29), is concerned with the contrast between the manna received by the mouth for bodily life and Christ to be received by faith for eternal life. It is the affirmation of a great principle without express application of it to Holy Communion. However, a little later, on verses 41, 42, after Christ

\* St. Augustine, in *Joan. tract.* 25, 26.



has spoken of Himself as the bread from heaven, but before He has spoken of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, St. Augustine virtually repeats the saying: "To believe on Him, this it is to eat the living bread. He that believeth eateth."

It is the same principle which underlies his teaching on membership of the Church: sacramental only, as baptized but living unworthily; spiritual, as Christians at heart but not yet baptized; sacramental and spiritual, as good Christians. These latter are the perfect or complete members, he says. It is the principle of the widow's mite and of Hezekiah's prayer.\* God can take the will for the deed and bestow His gifts and grace on it, because the faith-inspired, loving will, the state or orientation or directional energy of the man, is more fundamental and vital than what the man is able to do.

In a rubric of the Office of Extreme Unction (whatever may be its date) the Sarum and York Manuals and the Sarum Pontifical quote St. Augustine's actual words. If, for any good reason, the sick man cannot communicate sacramentally, the priest is to say, "Frater, in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides et bona voluntas: tantum crede et manducasti."† This rubric, expanded but practically the same, is in the Book of Common Prayer of all dates. Another application of the principle is likewise in the Sarum Manual: that except in *articulo mortis* no one is to be admitted to Communion unless he has been confirmed or has been for some good reason debarred from Confirmation.‡ This provision also is made in the Confirmation Service of the Book of Common Prayer of 1662.

Our earliest theological formulation of Spiritual Communion may be that of Albert the Great.§ Following St. Augustine's principle, he distinguishes "three ways of receiving the real Body of Christ: first, that which is sacramental but not spiritual, or a Communion made unworthily; secondly, that which is both sacramental and spiritual, or a Communion made worthily; and, thirdly, that which is spiritual and not sacramental, in which some receive Christ spiritually and not sacramentally by uniting themselves with Him by the memory of His Passion and Sacrifice."|| St. Thomas Aquinas,¶ following him, adds that for a profitable Spiritual Communion there must be the effectual desire for Sacramental Communion, and this desire must be acted on when opportunity occurs.\*\*

\* 2 Chron. xxx. 17 ff.

† Maskell, *Monumenta etc.*, 2nd ed., 1822, vol. i., p. 112.

‡ Maskell, *op. cit.*, vol. i., cclix.; from Archbishop Peckham's *Constitutions*, 1287; Lyndwood, Prov. 1, Tit. 6.

§ B. 1193.

|| Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, vol. i., p. 320.

¶ B. 1226.

\*\* *Summa*, III., lxxx., i. 3 and 11.



In *The Ancren Riwele* (early thirteenth century) the anchoresses, who were only permitted fifteen Communions in the year, were on other days to make acts of Spiritual Communion at the Elevation of the Host and at the Pax; and a long and beautiful form of it is given them.

But it is a curious thing that, in strong contrast with the German and Flemish mystics, still more with the mystics of the Latin countries, the early English mystics in their religion take little account of the Sacrament of the Altar.

Thomas à Kempis, in the *Imitation of Christ*, in a chapter written to urge frequent Sacrament at Communion (Book IV. [iii.], ch. x., l. 64 ff. Hirsche), recommends Spiritual Communion when Sacramental Communion cannot be had. So does he in *De Solitudine et Silentio*, ch. ii., no. 33, and *Sermo 4 ad Novitios*, no. 3. So does St. Gertrude, *Legatus divinæ providutiæ*, book III.; and Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, quotes to the same effect from Guillaume de St. Thierry (1148), Bischof Otto v. Bamberg, and *Guigonis Cartusiensis Epistola ad fratres de Monte Dei*. Meister Eckhart also recommends it. This recommendation, however, seems to be somewhat rare among the early Flemish and German ascetical writers—at least, in any very definite form.

The next landmark is the Council of Trent. This reasserts St. Thomas's doctrine of the three sorts of Communion.\* In the Catechism this is repeated, with a reference to the teaching of St. Augustine, and with the significant addition that serious loss is incurred by those who, when they might communicate sacramentally, are content with Spiritual Communion.†

The official doctrine is consistent. But, as the warning of the Catechism hints, the teaching of individual Saints and the practice of Saints and devout people has often overstepped the mark and brought in a certain confusion, and the common people have not been slack to adopt, as an alternative to Holy Communion, with its responsibilities and its practical inconveniences, a practice which presented no such difficulties.

This seems to have taken place chiefly in Italy and France, where Spiritual Communion has been strongly pressed. The temper of the Spanish mystics, generally speaking, would seem rather to have been that of moths perpetually burning themselves up before the Blessed Sacrament itself in the adventure of fiery adoration. St. Theresa wonders at the spirit of her nuns at Salamanca, who, when they were without Reservation for three or four years, "bore all with a contentment to praise God for:

\* Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., c. 8.

† Catechism, pars. 2, cap. 4, qu. liii.



and some of them said to me that . . . they lived there as happily as if they had the Blessed Sacrament.”\*

Numerous and signal miraculous appearances and pronouncements of Divine approval have been recorded to recommend the practice; *e.g.*, St. Leonard of Port Maurice† writes: “O blessed Spiritual Communion, hidden treasure, but so little known. To shew us how pleasing to Him is this manner of Communion, our Lord has willed, often by evident miracles, to hear the desires of His servants by communicating them with His own hands, as happened to St. Clare of Montefalco, to St. Catherine of Sienna, to St. Lidwine; or, again, by the ministry of the angels, as to the Seraphic Doctor St. Bonaventura, and to two holy Bishops, Honorius and Firmin; or, again, by the hands of the most Blessed Virgin, as to St. Sylvester. . . .”‡

St. Alphonse de Liguori narrates more of such manifestations. He continues: “Blessed Angela of the Cross . . . used to make a hundred Spiritual Communions every day, and a hundred more every night. . . . It is not necessary to be fasting, to have a priest, or to spend a long time. Hence we may make a Spiritual Communion as often as we please in the day.”§ S. Antoni says: “For Spiritual Communion, a sigh, an elevation of the heart suffices.”

The conditional, deliberate, solemn exercise which the Doctors of the Church appear to contemplate has come down to the practice of acts or ejaculations such as are made by members of every sort of Christian organization, the only differentia being that they must have at least tacit reference to Sacramental Communion. ||

Not hundreds but thousands of times, by day and night, devout Russians repeat the words: “Jesus Christ, Son of God, have pity on me the sinner.” As a Russian theologian puts it: “Simple people and monks *live* on this ejaculatory prayer.”

For *The Cloud of Unknowing* (fourteenth century) this *point de repère* would be too long and full, with too much of self in it. “. . . Take thee but a little word of one syllable. . . . And such is this word GOD or this word LOVE . . . fasten this word in thy heart so that it never go thence for thing that befalleth. This word shall be thy shield and thy spear.”

\* *Book of the Foundations*, ch. xix.

† B. 1676.

‡ Quoted from *Vain Fears* etc., by S. Antoni, S.T.D., p. 80.

§ *The True Spouse of Jesus Christ* (A.D. 1760), ch. xviii., sec. 8.

|| There have, of course, been many ups and downs in the history of frequent Sacramental Communion and its conditions; Popes, Superior Generals, Saints, Jansenists, and others pulling one way or another at divers times and in divers countries, through the Christian centuries. And with the variations of theory and practice so caused, has the practice of Spiritual Communion varied, both positively and inversely.



For other early English mystics the word would be JESUS.

It would be profitable to study these and the many other spearheads (perhaps including non-Christian, such as OM), with their action and reaction on the different types of devotion which they produce and are produced by; but our present concern is only with the Latin devotion.

In the writings of the English divines of the sixteenth and following centuries there is little mention of Spiritual Communion: their force was spent on endeavouring to bring back to more frequent Sacramental Communion a people who had long been used to communicate once a year.

Since the Tractarian Revival acts of Spiritual Communion have been found in most Anglican as in Roman Catholic manuals of devotion. It is perhaps a pity that the Doctors' instruction on their use is not always given in these manuals.

It is quite certain that such acts have been and are used with spiritual joy and sweetness, and sometimes also with effects of grace comparable to the effects of Sacramental Communion. But there is at all times the danger known to the framers of the Trent Catechism of confusing them with the Sacramental Communion on which they rest.

In our time this seems to have taken place on a rather large scale in South India. The Joint Committee for the Proposed Scheme of Union, in their official Draft Basis of Union,\* commit themselves to the statement that: "The uniting Churches recognize, however, that Christ has bestowed His grace with undistinguishing regard on all their ministries and has used them all greatly to His glory. All are therefore real ministries of the Word and the Sacraments in Christ's Church, nor can any Church say that the Sacraments and other ministrations of ministries which He has blessed are invalid. . . . All the ministers of the uniting Churches will from the inauguration of the union be recognized as equally ministers of the united Church without distinction or difference."

To assist in establishing these positions a strong appeal has been made to personal experiences in the Joint Meetings which took place in 1933, when Wesleyans and Free Church ministers attended an Anglican celebration of the Holy Eucharist and were admitted to Communion; and the Anglican delegates reciprocated their action, experiencing great spiritual joy and strong assurance of grace received through their friends' ministrations.

No doubt can or need be felt of the reality of these experiences. The question is of the inferences and conclusions drawn therefrom. As concerns spiritual emotions we have not waited for W. James and Starbuck to enlighten us. It has always

\* *Proposed Scheme of Union*, 5th ed., 1935, p. 2.



been a commonplace of the Doctors and Saints of the Church to warn people off from putting a constructive value on them. They are what they are; but their value for the spiritual life depends on the use made of them, not on their supposed provenance.

Nor is all grace given sacramentally. Again, it is a commonplace that, in the popular phrase, the grace of God overflows the Sacraments. (It might be truer to say that the wide-flowing grace of God, flowing where it lists, flows constantly and unfailingly into the channels of the Sacraments.) And here comes in, in particular, the teaching of the Western Church on Spiritual Communion in regard both to feeling and to grace. As Baxter truly says: "We might have a fuller taste of Christ and heaven in every common meal than most men have in a Sacrament."\* And (e.g.) to quote St. Alphonsus: "[Christ] said to the Venerable Jane of the Cross, that as often as she communicated spiritually, she received a grace similar to that which she derived from her Sacramental Communions."† Is not this enough?

But if any ordinary Anglican is inclined to think that he would, on occasion, do as was done by Anglicans at the South India Meetings, there is an acid test which he may apply to his own judgement, helping to make his mind clear to himself. To any of us ordinary Church-people it would never occur to make any difference between being communicated straight from the Altar or from the Reserved Sacrament. In either case it is "the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful" which is given to us, neither more nor less. A work worked has made it what it is. There is no question about it. But let any such ordinary Churchman imagine, if possible, a parallel procedure in and from a Free Church chapel, and imagine himself a sick person desiring to partake of the Sacrament of the Altar, and ask himself what would be his judgement in such a case.

Everyone thankfully acknowledges the enrichment brought to Christian thought and life through non-Catholic organizations; and perhaps most of all by the Friends, who abjure all ministries and sacraments. No one has the wish or the authority to "say that the Sacraments and other ministrations of ministries which He has blessed are invalid."‡ That is not our business. But it does concern the Church to maintain that individual personal experience is no sufficient foundation for Catholic doctrine.

Were not the spiritual emotion and the uplifting and illuminating grace experienced in South India just what one would

\* *The Saint's Rest*, ch. vii., ii. 6.

† *The True Spouse of Jesus Christ*, ch. xviii., sec. 3.

‡ *Ut supra.*



naturally expect under such conditions ? It should be a means of grace only to kneel in silence beside one of those devout and devoted Wesleyans and Free Churchmen who are giving their whole lives to Christ in the difficulties of South Indian work. And how should not deep and true spiritual emotion be stirred by the meeting together before God of men already aflame with a common desire for the full coming of His Kingdom in South India ? How could there but be a heightening of spiritual faculties, and grace be given in answer to faith ? A true Spiritual Communion it was bound to be.

Surely one may desire that this spiritual fellowship, with all the co-operation which naturally follows from it, may increase and deepen from year to year, unvexed by the bringing-in of matters of doubtful disputation. To move freely and harmoniously on common ground is best for work, for life, and for example to unbelievers and believers: and also for the good estate of the Catholic Church.

For people scattered all over the world there is a quite opposite difficulty, psychologically speaking. Church-people who go overseas often find themselves in spiritually lonely places, with but the scantiest opportunities for any sort of common worship, and almost entirely bereft of the Sacraments by which at home they were habitually nourished and cleansed. Naturally they are tempted to lose heart; and sometimes they even fall off from any sort of religious practice, and lose their faith. The teaching of St. Augustine ought to help them.

An eminent diplomatist, now departed, whose work had taken him into spiritually desolate places, was once talking over this difficulty, and spoke of a friend of his, a Roman Catholic priest in a lonely seaport. It was only by the rarest chance that a fellow-priest came that way to give him absolution. But every evening in church he went through exactly what would have been done had a priest been present; and he departed believing that he had received the full grace of the Sacrament of Penance. The diplomatist's summing up of the conversation, perhaps too negative in form, was this: that, so long as one could go on feeling the want of a sacramental means of grace, that was practically as good as having it. *Crede et manducasti.*

✠ AGNES MASON, C.H.F.



## A SKIT ON GREEK PHILOSOPHY

BY ONE HERMIAS PROBABLY OF THE REIGN OF  
JULIAN, A.D. 362-363

THIS skit\* was written as an elaboration of the words of "the blessed Paul" to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iii. 19), "the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God"—"a not inept remark." It is a useful and witty introduction by a Christian sophist to the study of Greek philosophy. The writer, Hermias, assigns the beginning of this earthly philosophy to the apostasy of the angels and says this is the reason why the philosophers put forth such contradictory dogmas and disagree so much among themselves.

Of their divergent opinions on the soul he gives the following: "Democritus and others say it is 'fire,' the Stoics 'air,' others 'mind,' others 'motion' (Heraclitus), others 'an exhalation,' others 'number endowed with the power of motion' (Pythagoras), others 'impregnating water' (Hippon), others 'element proceeding from elements,' others 'harmony' (Deinarchus), others 'blood' (Critias), others 'spirit,' others 'unity' (Monad) like Pythagoras. How many discourses have been given about these theories! How many, I say, of Sophists disputing rather than discovering the truth!

"Well, let them disagree about the nature of the soul, they surely will agree about other things. But no. One holds that pleasure is a good, others that it is an evil, others that it is between the two. Some say the nature of the soul is mortal, others that it is immortal, others that it continues on (after death) for a little while, others make it pass into animals (transmigration), others dissolve it into atoms, others give it three successive appearances in bodily form, others give it a cycle of three thousand years.† What may one call this nonsense (τρεπεία)—insanity, madness or quarrelling (στράσις), or all these combined? If they have discovered anything true, let them agree about it, and I will gladly believe them.‡ But if

\* It has been suggested that Hermias could have obtained his knowledge of Greek philosophy from the *Placita* of the Pseudo-Plutarch, A.D. 150, about). Menzel Diels and Harnack assign this skit to the fifth and sixth centuries. Julian's reign is suggested here. Although the work has many resemblances to the *Cohortatio* (Pseudo-Justin), also of uncertain date, its bantering tone suggests a date when the fierceness of the early controversy had subsided, and Julian's attempt to resuscitate paganism was not taken *au grand sérieux*. † Plato, *Phædrus*, 245.

‡ The *Cohortatio*, ascribed to Justin. The writer visited Rome (c. 37). (4) asks, after a brief summary of these conflicting theories, "How, Greeks, can those who desire salvation safely consider that they can learn the true religion from those who are proved unable to persuade themselves not to quarrel (στρασιάζειν) with one another or to oppose each other's dogmas." See also *Cohort.*, 35. They not only quarrel (στρασιάζουσι) with one another, but put forward different opinions at different times.



they pull the soul in different directions, one to this 'nature,' another to that 'essence' and turn it from one matter into another, I confess I am vexed at this ebb and flow (*παλίρροια*) of things. For I am now immortal and I rejoice; anon I become mortal and I weep; again I am dissolved into atoms, I become water, then I become air, and again I become fire. After a little while I am neither fire nor air. Then I am made an animal, and again a fish. So then I have dolphins for brothers, and when I see myself I know not how to call myself, whether man or dog, or wolf or bull, or bird or serpent, or dragon or chimera (a mixture of lion and man). For I am turned into all these animals by the philosophers, denizens of the earth, the water, the air, winged, many-formed wild, tame, mute, musical, irrational, rational; I swim, I fly, I soar aloft, I creep, I run, I sit. Here comes Empedocles and turns me into a 'bush.'\*

"Since the philosophers cannot reach unanimity in the matter of the soul of man, they can hardly set forth the truth regarding the gods (*θεοί*) or the world. Yet they have the courage, I do not like to say 'stupidity' (*ἔμπληξία*) to attempt this. They, who cannot discover their own soul,† investigate the nature of the very gods, and those who know nothing about their own body very officiously settle the nature of the world. Here too they assume opposite and contending principles. When Anaxagoras takes me into his class he teaches me that if it is mind (*nous*) that is the beginning of all things, the cause and Lord of the universe, giving arrangement to the ill-arranged, motion to the motionless, separation to the confused, order to the disorderly. When he says this, he is my friend and I believe in his doctrine. But then Melissus and Parmenides rise up against him. Parmenides declares that substance is one, and that it is immortal, infinite, without motion and homogeneous. Again, I know not how, but I come over to this opinion and Parmenides expels Anaxagoras from my soul. Yet when I think that I have found a dogma that nothing can change, Anaximenes takes up his parable and cries out, 'But I tell you that it is air, and this condensed forms water and land, but rarefied ether and fire.' Again I agree with him and I love Anaximenes. Empedocles, however, stands opposite to me threateningly, and shouts aloud from Ætna:‡ 'The principles are enmity and friendship, the

\* Plutarch and Galen declared that Empedocles said that trees came up from the ground, the first of living things (*δῶα*). Aristotle says that Empedocles called trees *δῶα* or animals. See Lucretius, v. 780-790: "Tellus herbas virgultaque primum sustulit."

† This argument was used by Cicero, Philo and Theophilus (A.D. 180), 11. 10.

‡ He is said to have thrown himself down the crater of Ætna to prove himself to be a god; but the crater ejected his sandal!



one separating, the other uniting, and their strife makes all things. I define them as like and unlike, finite and infinite, eternal and created.'

"Well done, Empedocles; I follow you even to the fiery crater.' But then Protagorus stands on the other side and drags me away, saying, 'Man is the norm and standard of things, what come before his senses are things, what do not are not even in the "forms" of existence.' I am flattered by this statement of Protagoras, to think that everything or nearly everything rests with man. On the other hand, Thales declares the truth to me, defining water as the creative principle, saying: 'Everything is formed of the moist principle and is resolved into it, and the earth rides upon the water.' Why then should I not believe Thales, the oldest of the Ionian philosophers? But his fellow-citizen\* Anaximander declares that eternal motion is an older principle than the moist one, and that this is the cause of birth and decay. And surely Anaximander is worthy of belief.

"But is not Archelaus a famous man? And he maintained that 'the hot' and 'the cold' were the principles of creation. Plato does not agree with him. He gives as his principles God, matter and form. At last I am fully persuaded; for how could I not believe a philosopher who made 'the chariot of Zeus'?† (*Phædrus*, 246 E.). Behind him stands his pupil Aristotle, who is jealous of that chariot building. His principles are quite different: the Active and the Passive. The Active is impassive and is the ether. The Passive has four qualities, dryness, moistness, warmth, coldness. All things become and pass through their mutual changes. By this time I am really wearied of being tossed up and down, and I shall stand upon the opinion of Aristotle, and henceforth let no theory trouble me.

"But what indeed is to become of me? For two of the older school, Pherecydes and Leucippus are hamstringing (*νευροκοποῦσι*) my soul. Pherecydes declares that the principles are Zeus or Æther, Earth, and Saturn or Time. The æther is the active principle, the earth passive, and time is that in which things are made. But the old fellows are jealous of one another. Leucippus declares that all that is nonsense, and that the

\* Both were citizens of Miletus. Justin's (?) *Cohortatio* (3) also stresses the fact that Anaximander was from "the same Miletus" as Thales, and that the latter was the founder of the school of natural philosophy.

† The *Cohortatio ad Gentes* ascribed to Justin refers to this chariot of Zeus in c. 31 as borrowed from Ezekiel x. 18, 19, the chariot of the cherubim (Hermias quoted from *Phædrus*, 249 A.); and in c. 6 it mentions the three Platonic principles—God, matter, form. In cc. 3-6 it gives a brief summary of the tenets of the philosophers, pointing out their contradictory statements.



principles are infinite in number, ever in motion and very tiny. The lighter ascend as fire and air, the denser sink down as water and earth. How long am I to receive such teachings and yet learn nothing true, unless perchance Democritus can save me from error? He says the principles are 'being' and 'not being.' That which 'is' is full, that which 'is not' is void. That which is full in the void makes everything by change or form. Perhaps I might agree with the good Democritus and have a laugh\* with him, did not Heraclitus lead me away, weeping and saying, "The principle of all things is fire, which has two qualities of thinness and thickness, the one active, the other passive, the one blending, the other separating." 'Hold, enough,' say I; 'I am already intoxicated with so many principles.' But then Epicurus takes me aside and begs me not to treat with scorn his lovely theory of atoms and vacuum, by whose manifold complications all things come into being and pass away.

"My excellent Epicurus," say I, 'I do not contradict you, but Cleanthes,† raising his head from the well, laughs at your theory. "I myself," quoth he, "am drawing up (from the well) the true principle, God and matter. Earth passes into water, water into air, air is borne aloft, but fire runs along the surface of the earth and the soul passes through the whole world, and we receiving a part of it become animated."'

"Although I have heard such a number, yet another lot flows in from Libya,‡ Carneades, Cleitomachus and all their companies, trampling under foot the theories of others, declaring that the universe is incomprehensible, that a false appearance (phantasia) (ψευδὴς φαντασία also in *Cohortatio* 38) is ever beside the truth. What shall I do at all? I have been such a time in misery. How shall I eject so many theories from my mind? If nothing is comprehensible, the truth has passed from man's life and philosophy is fighting a shadow and has no knowledge of realities.

"Moreover, other of the ancient school, Pythagoras and his clansmen, grave and silent men, hand to me other theories, as mysteries§ and their great secret 'Ipse dixit.' They say the 'Monad' is the principle of all things and from its form and numbers the elements arise. And then he gives the number,

\* Democritus the laughing, Heraclitus the weeping philosopher.

† Cleanthes was a water-carrier.

‡ Cyrene. These are "new Academicians." The nautical terms ἐπιρρεῖ, παλῖρροια, and the mention of Laconia suggest that the writer lived somewhere in Greece, probably in Athens.

§ The *Cohortatio* (19) has μυστικῶς, Hermias ὡς περ μυστήρια. The allegorical character of his teaching is stressed in the *Cohortatio*, in which is a similar summary in cc. 4 and 19 of the teaching of Pythagoras.



form and measure of everything. Fire he likens to a pyramid, air to a figure with eight surfaces, water to a figure with twenty surfaces, æther to a figure of twelve surfaces. Everything is arranged in triangles and squares. And so Pythagoras measures the world.

"And now, inspired by Pythagoras, oblivious of home, native land, wife and children—these things no longer trouble me—I ascend into the very æther myself, and borrowing the cubit rule from Pythagoras proceed to measure fire. For Zeus's measurements are out of date. And unless this great being, or body, this great soul, I mean I myself, ascend to heaven and measure the æther, the empire of Zeus is done for. But when I have measured it I shall let him know how many angles fire has. Then I descend from heaven, and having partaken of a light refreshment of olives, figs and greens, I set out by the quickest way to the water and measure the moist substance by cubit, inch and half inch, and calculate its depth, in order to inform Poseidon how great his empire, the sea, is. I traverse the whole earth in one day, making up its number, measurement, and forms. For I am convinced that a man of my importance and weight shall not miss a single foot of it. I also know the number of the stars, the fishes and the animals, and by weighing the world in balance, I can easily discover the weight.\* So far my soul, occupied in such matters, has been eager to rule the universe. But Epicurus stooping over me says, 'My dear fellow, you have only measured one world, and there are many, nay, infinite worlds. So again I am forced to speak of many heavens, and many other æthers too. Come along then without delay, get victuals for a few days and make off to the worlds of Epicurus. I easily fly over the boundaries, Tethys, and ocean, and I enter into a new world as a new city, and measure everything in a few days. Then I ascend to a third world, and then a fourth, a fifth, a twentieth, a thousandth, and God knows where! For it is all the darkness of ignorance,† black deceit, infinite error, immature imagination ἀτελής φαντασία (the *Cohortatio* has ψευδής φαντασία [381], incomprehensible ignorance, unless indeed I intend to count the very atoms‡ of which so many worlds consist, so as to leave nothing without investigation, especially of those necessary and useful matters on which the happiness of state and home depends.

"Accordingly, I have gone over all these things in my desire to demonstrate the mutually contradictory character of these

\* Modern science can approximately ascertain the weight of the earth, planets and sun.

† The *Cohortatio* (11) describes the opinions of the philosophers as full of ignorance and deceit (in the same order).

‡ We call them "electrons," "protons" and "photons."



theories, and how such an investigation leads to endless and boundless error, and the final end is inexplicable and unprofitable, and is supported by no manifest fact or sure utterance."

So ends this clever brochure on Greek philosophy. It is at once a brief, graphic, lucid and easily remembered summary of the various theories of the different Greek schools of philosophy, and a powerful argument based upon their mutual contradictions for the futility of the whole system. Written in a light, humorous, mocking style, its effectiveness is enhanced by the playfulness of its form. Hermias is the dear friend of all the philosophers. He has not a harsh word for anyone—he apologizes for using the word "stupidity"—he listens as an interested and then a converted adherent to every one of the philosophers in turn until he is led away from them by another philosopher, and so on until he has exhausted many schools and many theories in his rapid and necessarily superficial survey. Then he sums up briefly and trenchantly against the whole system.

It commends itself by its brevity, the simplicity of its style, and the humour and point of its wit. Its pictures are imprinted indelibly upon our memory. Who could forget Cleanthes, who during his student days supported himself by drawing water in the gardens at night, popping his head up out of a well to make a statement, or Empedocles shouting up from the crater, or Hermias himself weighing the world in scales and hastily sounding the depth of the ocean with a foot rule? It is not of course original. It is based to some extent on Justin's polemic against philosophy\* and on Tatian's oration against the Greeks, and might stand as an amplification of the latter's third chapter: "Let not the assemblies of the philosophers lead you away. They teach contradictory theories, and say whatever comes into their head. There are many collisions (*προσκρούματα*) among them, for one hates the other, and they teach rival doctrines, contending for the best places."

And in the twenty-fourth chapter Tatian contrasts the many conflicting theories of Greek philosophy with the uniform teaching of the Christians. "Do you follow the doctrines of Plato? Then the epicurean Sophist is openly opposed to you. Do you wish to belong to the school of Aristotle, one of the followers of Democritus attacks you with abuse." And so on. But Tatian is virulent, and mentions some of the horrors of Greek mythology, as Justin and other Christian apologists do. Hermias, however,

\* Justin in *Ap. I.* 4 dwells on the contradictory teachings of the philosophers. In 5 he praises Socrates for setting men free from the fear of demons by reason (*logos*). In 46 he declares that those who lived with *logos* were Christians, Socrates, Heraclitus, and others. In *Dial.* 9 he declares that Christianity is "the only safe and useful philosophy."



does not mean to offend any of the philosophic schools. He was probably a convert from philosophy, and wrote at a time when Greek philosophy was either in vogue or revived, as in the reign of Julian, A.D. 362.

Julian made a great and determined effort to revive the teaching of Greek philosophy, and at the same time to suppress Christian teaching in the schools and universities. On July 17, A.D. 362, he issued an edict on the appointment of teachers, followed by a rescript forbidding Christians to teach the classical authors, which had the effect for a time of closing educational careers to Christians. At the same time Julian gave a fresh impulse to the study of Greek poets and philosophers. In his writings he refers frequently to Heraclitus, Democritus, Epicurus, Anaxagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Empedocles, Thales, and Pythagoras, coupled with Socrates, and doubtless his favourite. His letter to Themistios may be described as a laudation of philosophy. And in his oration (vi.) to the uneducated Cynics he describes the attempts made (by Christians) to lure the young away from philosophy, by repeating stories about them. "The genuine disciples of Pythagoras and Plato and Aristotle are called 'sorcerers' (*γόητες*) and 'sophists,' 'conceited' and 'quacks' (198)." In this brochure Hermias does call some of the philosophers "sophists" and philosophy "portentous stuff" (*τερατεία*) and "madness," expressions which would have been resented by Julian. Both Julian and this writer speak of the "gravity" (*σεμνότης*) of the Pythagoreans, their "mysteries" and their "silence" (both use the word *σιωπηλός*). It is, therefore, quite possible, as Ceillier (vi. 332) argued, that this little work was written in Julian's day. The Christians were by no means intimidated by his repressive educational measures of A.D. 362.\* The elder and the younger Apollinaris turned portions of the Old Testament and the New into Greek hexameters and Platonic dialogues. They were ably supported by other Christian scholars, such as the author of this witty and clever skit on the Greek philosophers. The object of the writer is to demonstrate from the want of inner harmony and logical connection and relation between the various theories put forward that the whole system was wrong and was inspired by the "apostasia." Clement of Alexandria, who gives an account of Greek philosophy (*Strom.* I. xxiv.-xxviii.), referred to that view with the object of refuting it.

An explanation of the origin of philosophy which he (Clement) favoured himself was, that it was borrowed by the philosophers

\* See Ammianus Marcellinus (22. 10. 7), who condemned this action of forbidding Christian masters of rhetoric and grammar to teach in the schools because they did not believe in the theology of Homer and the other works they taught.



from the Old Testament, especially the teaching of Moses,\* who lived long before this (*Strom.* I. cxv.). But his parallels do not carry conviction. We do not, for example, see how Aristotle was influenced by the Psalm "Lord in heaven is Thy mercy and Thy truth as far as the clouds" to bring providence as far down as the moon, or that Epicurus took his idea of chance from "vanity of vanities" (*Strom.* v. 24), or that the Sabbath is found in Homer. With regard to the view that the ideas came to the Greeks through the fallen angels or the "apostasia" Clement said: "Let them understand, who say that philosophy has come from the devil, that the devil can be transformed into an angel of light. If he prophesies as an angel of light, it will be truth; if he prophesies things angelic and clear, they will be useful.† And again, we may say, generally, that everything that is necessary and useful to life comes from God, and that philosophy was given to the Greeks as a sort of testament (or covenant, διαθήκη) of their own, a step towards the Christian philosophy, even if the Greek philosophers wittingly shut their ears to the truth." Whichever may be the correct explanation "of this wisdom of the world" (648), he traces God's hand in it all, and holds that Providence can make the wickedness of the apostasy promote the truth. The text "All that ever came before Me were thieves and robbers" (John x. 8) has been used, he says, by the opponents of Greek philosophy, some of whom hold that certain powers, lapsed from heaven, inspired the whole philosophy, whereas Providence directed to a useful end the issue of that deed for man.‡ He himself asserts that if it does not contain the whole truth, and is weak in following the precepts of the Lord, yet it prepares the way for the royal doctrine, in some way training and forming the character and preparing him who believes in Providence for the reception of the truth (c. xvi., finis).

In these two works of Hermias and Clement we have two divergent views of Greek philosophy; one might call both of them extreme. Remembering the Latin adage, "In medio

\* Justin's (?) *Cohortatio* (20-22) says that Plato learned in Egypt the monotheism of Moses and the prophets, but, through fear of the Areopagus, did not mention the name of Moses. It argues that *Timæus* 27, D. 28, γνέ, must distinguish between "that which always is and has no genesis" from "that which has genesis but never is" which was based upon Exod. iii. 14, "I AM that I AM" and "I AM." In c. 25 it asserts that the passage in *Leges*, 715 E., "God, as the ancient saying has it, has the beginning, middle and end of all things," refers to the law of Moses, and the saying "I AM that I AM," which signifies not one time but three—present, past and future. It also cites Diodorus the historian as saying that Moses was the first legislator. It refers to Diodorus in other places (c. 9), quoting a long passage from him (l. 94), praising Moses as the first to persuade men to use written laws, ἀνδρα καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ μέγαν καὶ τῷ βίῳ ἱκανώτατον. Diodorus got his information from Egyptian priests.

† *Strom.* vi. 647.

‡ *Strom.* i. 310 (Paris).



tutissimus ibis," and recognizing that Clement and other Fathers emphasized perhaps unduly and unwarrantably the importance of Greek philosophy as a preparation for and support of the Gospel, while other writers like Tatian, a converted philosopher, perhaps equally unduly emphasized its hostility and opposition to Christianity, we shall be probably on safe ground if we commit ourselves to neither view, but study for ourselves the many points of agreement and the equally numerous points of difference. We shall find that whatever is good in Greek philosophy comes from the same Divine Spirit, Who inspired Hebrew prophecy and Christian doctrine. As fellow-students in the quest of truth we must be grateful to the Greek philosophers for the problems they have attempted to solve and for their logical gifts and achievements.\* We can admire their reasoning powers, their appreciation of the True, the Beautiful and the Good, their precision in definition, their meticulous care in quotation, their profound researches, their vast knowledge, while avoiding their speculative errors, their superlative conceit and egotism, their academical jealousy and intellectual rivalry, and above all their moral faults.†

The *Cohortatio* (38), on which this work appears to be based, concludes with an appeal for belief in Him whose advent was foretold by the Sibyl,‡ and who was originally (ὑπάρχων) the Logos of God, ἀχώρητος uncontainable in power, and who, having assumed (ἀναλαβών) the manhood made in the image and likeness of God, recalled us to the religion of our ancient ancestors, which their children had abandoned, led away by the teaching of an envious demon to the worship of those who were not gods.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

\* See *Clement of Alexandria* (S.P.C.K.), pp. 142-148, by present writer.

† See Diogenes Laertius, iii. 23, on Plato's "loves," vii. 13 on Zeno's vices and the indecency of some of the works of Chrysippus. Also see the Platonic dialogues (e.g. the *Charmides*, 155 D.), Lucian's works generally and the Pseudo-Lucian's *Amores*, and Xenophon's *Symposium* for the immorality of Socrates.

‡ In c. 16 it quotes lines of the Sibyl (v. 7-9), also in Theophilus (*ad. Autol.* ii. 36), and others in Clem. Alex., *Protrept.* iv. 62.



## MISCELLANEA

### NOTE ON ST. MATTHEW xix. 3-12

THE anonymous writer of a note on St. Matt. xix. 10-12 in the December number represents the whole passage (3-12) as amounting to this. I quote his own summary: "Marriage is the ideal for man, but some are born or become physically incapable of it, while others are voluntary celibates 'for the kingdom of heaven's sake. . . .' On the principle of true asceticism (Mark ix. 43-47) . . . the proper course for those who cannot live up to the ideal of marriage is to abstain from it." As I have recently written a "Theology Occasional Paper" on *Clerical Celibacy*, I offer the following observations:

I. Time after time this writer says that the teaching of the earlier verses on divorce (3-9) is "that marriage was God's will for man" (p. 348) . . . "marriage is the ideal" . . . "Christ says that marriage is the ideal for man" (p. 349), and again p. 350, "He regarded marriage as God's ideal for man." But I can find no such teaching, nor any comparison between marriage and non-marriage, either explicit or implied, in verses 3-9. What I find is an uncompromising assurance that divorce is unlawful, and that re-marriage after divorce is adultery. Now, I know that some writers regard this ruling as, not strict legislation, even for the Christian Church, but as "an ideal to be aimed at." But (i.) it was given in answer to the question whether divorce was "lawful" (ver. 3, *ei ēξεστιν*, "morally possible"); (ii.) it is based explicitly on what theologians call the Law of Nature ("He that hath made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said *For this cause*, etc.); and surely what is natural in this best sense of the word is a fair basis for legislation, and ought to be generally possible, given moral effort. It seems to me misleading to use the word "ideal" in this connection, more especially when, as in this case, the writer proceeds to interpret verse 11 to mean that man cannot be generally expected to reach the ideal. Again, he says (p. 348) that "our Lord declared that marriage was . . . something for which man should be prepared to sacrifice everything . . . even the most sacred ties" (Matt. xix. 4 f.). What He said was, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, etc." To describe this perfectly normal process, by which a man, when he marries, leaves his own home to make a new home for his wife and children, as "sacrificing everything" seems to me to be misleading. The phrase suggests verse 29 and the great sacrifices made by those who leave relations and home and property and all that the bridegroom looks forward to gaining and keeping for life, in order that they may follow Christ as missionaries and martyrs.

II. I pass now to the question of the meaning of verse 11. The question is whether our Lord meant, as this writer thinks, "Not all men can receive *my* saying about divorce," or whether, as I think, He meant, "all men cannot receive *your* saying about its being better not to marry than to be so strictly bound." This writer says (p. 349): "Of course this saying must refer to Christ's important saying about marriage. . . ." And he expounds the general drift as being, that our Lord allowed that His strict teaching could not be accepted by all, for it required a special gift of God to accept it. "Some are born or become physically incapable



of it, while others are voluntary celibates for the kingdom of heaven's sake. . . . Thus Christ shews that the proper course for those who cannot live up to the ideal of marriage is to abstain from it."

But is it conceivable that our Lord should have begun by setting up what is represented (quite wrongly, I think) as an *ideal* of conjugal fidelity, *which men in general could hardly be expected to attain*, and should have then gone on to counsel or require all who did not feel equal to such ideal fidelity to abstain from matrimony altogether?

I should have thought that total abstinence from any kind of sexual life would be precisely what these men would find most difficult. What reasonable legislator would advise all who shrank from the austerity of Christ's teaching on divorce, to enrol themselves in one or other section of the little company described in ver. 12? This exegesis seems to me quite wildly improbable. On the contrary, I think that by verse 11 our Lord meant, "Not all men can accept *your* suggestion that it were better not to marry at all; for such abstinence is only possible to those who (1) have (at the best) a *natural gift* for it, or (2) have been rendered incapable of marriage, or (3) have a *spiritual gift* for it, and forgo marriage for ascetical reasons (*i.e.*, prayer and fasting; cf. 1 Cor. vii.), or in order to preach the gospel unhindered by the responsibilities of a husband or parent."

III. And so we end by interpreting 12 ("He that is able to receive it, let him receive it") as permitting or encouraging, or even in some cases requiring, those who can receive the disciples' recommendation in verse 10, to do so.

Our commentator, being unwilling to accept this, says, "It is quite possible that the concluding phrase 'He that is able to receive it, let him receive it' is, like the phrase 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear,' an isolated saying and has been inserted here by the Evangelist." That is to say that the Evangelist made a misleading mistake. On *a priori* grounds I do not think this is possible. I think the Evangelist's literary ability, and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, illuminating his understanding, and the editorial providence of God, all make this extremely improbable; and what is more I am bold to claim that these *a priori* beliefs, being principles of *judgment*, are *critical* principles. And in any case, even if the saying "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear" ever is introduced without a true reference to its context, which I do not believe, it is no true parallel. For here the grammatical object of the verbs is "it," and "it" cannot live in a vacuum. It must refer to *something*. But, rightly or wrongly—my own views are clear—our anonymous commentator has a prejudice against celibacy. For him, our Lord, if He had preferred celibacy to marriage, would have been "a ruthless ascetic" (p. 350). To my mind it would be very strange if there were nothing in His teaching here or elsewhere (*e.g.*, St. Luke xxi. 34, 35) which threw any light of doctrine on the fact that He was Himself a Virgin, and the Son of a Virgin, or on the great, if unbalanced, efflorescence of virginity in the early Church, or on the traditional reverence in which virginity, when sought and cultivated by prayer as a spiritual gift and embraced in humility for the sake of the King and His Kingdom, has been held in the Catholic Church from the beginning. I am humbly thankful to stand with St. Paul in this matter in a generation which disparages his judgment and apostolic authority.

FRANCIS M. DOWNTON.



## THE AGE FOR CONFIRMATION AND THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCHES THROUGHOUT THE AGES

THE best age for Confirmation is the subject of much controversy, but there seems to be a consensus of opinion that the present custom of confirming generally at the age of fourteen is entirely wrong.

That this is so is surely borne out by the statement made some time ago that at least 50 per cent. of our Confirmation candidates are lost to the Church as effective members or regular communicants within three years after Confirmation, a statement which has never been challenged, and, in fact, many clergy would put the percentage much higher.

The question, however, has become more urgent at the present time owing to the reorganization of schools, when the pupils leave the Junior Schools at the age of eleven years and proceed to a Senior School, in many cases passing from a Church School to a Council School.

Experience teaches that there is a distinct difference in the knowledge of the Catechism and in the outlook of the children after being away for two or three years to another school.

As the children leave the Junior School at the age of eleven years, it does seem that it would be much more satisfactory for them to be confirmed before they leave their own village or parish school, say at the age of nine or ten years. Such a procedure would be very different to that of waiting until the age of fourteen or fifteen, a rule which is generally accepted by the Church of England. There is, however, no authority for such a rule except by general consent, and the Church has never made any pronouncement as to what is considered the "age of discretion," but it is left entirely to the views of individual Bishops.

The study of the practice of the Churches (Church of England, Roman Catholic, and Orthodox) throughout the ages gives a mass of interesting facts which make a very good case for the lowering of the age for Confirmation as generally accepted by the Bishops and the Church of England in these days.

In the early or Primitive Church the children were baptized and confirmed at the same time as nearly as possible, but as Confirmation was always administered by a Bishop an interval frequently elapsed between Baptism and Confirmation, because a Bishop was not available for sometimes some years, until the interval between the two rites became as much as seven or eight years.

A. J. Maclean says, and he gives his authorities: "In mediæval times the interval between Baptism and Confirmation grew to one year and then to seven. At Chichester, A.D. 1246, one year is named as the maximum. At Durham, about A.D. 1287, seven years. The Saxon Manual makes seven years the best age for Confirmation, after the child has learnt the *Paternoster*, *Ave Maria*, and *Credo*." First Communion then came before Confirmation.

Such was the state of things about the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there seemed to be a certain amount of indifference to Confirmation. The subject was brought into prominence, however, in the early sixteenth century by Martin Luther. He published his treatise on the Babylonish Captivity in 1520, and reduced the number of sacraments to three—Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist—thus excluding Confirmation from the



category. King Henry VIII. replied to Luther with his *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*, and he dealt in due course with Confirmation. This book won for him from the Pope the title, "Fidei Defensor," a title used by our Sovereigns in the present day. It is interesting to note that Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII. by Anne Boleyn, was born at the Palace at Greenwich on September 7, 1533. Three days later, on September 10, she was baptized by Stokesley, Bishop of London, and confirmed immediately afterwards by Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. The practice was a witness to the primitive order, in which Baptism and Confirmation were one rite.

During the period between the beginning of the Reformation and the Revolution of 1688 much was written in favour of and against Confirmation. Sometimes the objective side was stressed and at other times the subjective side. The age varied according to the views of the individual Bishops: (a) Agreed policy of Episcopate (1560-1561), 12 to 13 years; (b) Bishops of Coventry and Lichfield (1565), 7 years; (c) Bishop Strafford at Chester (1701), 14 years; (d) Archbishop Drummond (York, 1768), 15 to 22 years.

During this period the best treatise on Confirmation was that of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, 1663, which is called the greatest of all English books on Confirmation. With reference to the age for Confirmation, he says the sooner the better. No Anglican divine since has ever approached, let alone rivalled, Bishop Jeremy Taylor's work (*A Discourse of Confirmation*).

There was a gradual lapse in the practice of Confirmation according to the Prayer Book standard from the Revolution of 1688, and during the later years of the eighteenth century down to the degradation of the Confirmation in the Diocese of Ely in the earlier decades of the nineteenth century, but a revival begun by Evangelical Bishops of George IV.'s reign reached its height under Bishop Samuel Wilberforce (Bishop of Oxford, 1845-1869; Bishop of Winchester, 1869-1873).

The Confirmations of Bishop Wilberforce became so famous that by themselves they set a standard which was gradually followed in other Dioceses until it became, as it now is, the normal use.

This survey of the practice of the Rite of Confirmation would not be complete without a knowledge of how it is practised in the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches.

The Roman Catholic Church teaches that Confirmation is a sacrament, but not necessary to salvation.

Confirmation follows confession and First Communion, but is not absolutely necessary, although it is generally administered. There is no age-limit laid down by the Church, but it is generally considered that, as a rule, a child of seven or eight is able to appreciate the nature of a sacrament, and can then make his or her confession and receive the First Communion. Contrasting the Roman view with our own, does it not seem that by insisting on Confirmation before Holy Communion the Anglican Church makes Confirmation "necessary to salvation"? In connection with this point, however, in Resolution 12 of the Lambeth Conference, 1920, it is laid down "that no Anglican clergyman has any canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person coming up to receive it (unless that person has formally incurred the censure of the Church). If a question of the future admission of such person comes up, it is the clergyman's duty to refer the matter to the Bishop."



With regard to the Eastern Orthodox Church, their theologians regard the Western custom of postponing Confirmation for some years not only as at variance with tradition, but also as illogical. If infants are capable of receiving the grace of Baptism, why not also that of Confirmation? And why should the West have departed from primitive custom in this respect? It does seem that in these days we are stressing a great deal too much the subjective side of Confirmation instead of the objective side, whereby the child receives the free gift of the Holy Spirit to strengthen him for the temptations and snares and evils of life, and surely that strength is required by the child at the age of ten to eleven years or younger. Confirmation is sometimes called the "Sacrament of Warriors," but the Church gives the young warrior his armour after he has entered the strife.

Charles Wheatley (1686-1742), Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, who wrote fully on Confirmation, in discussing the age for Confirmation, says:

"It is very evidently the design of our Church that children be confirmed before they have opportunities of being acquainted with sin; that so the Holy Spirit may take early possession of their youthful hearts and prevent those sins to which, without His assistance, the very tenderness of their age would be apt to expose them."

EDWARD T. CLARKE.

### THE THORN IN THE FLESH

ALTHOUGH critics differ as to the exact nature of St. Paul's thorn in the flesh, it is usually assumed that it was a physical infirmity. The majority take the view that it was malaria or epilepsy, but to the present writer it seems clear that the "thorn" was not a physical infirmity at all.

We know that St. Paul's personal appearance was unprepossessing (2 Cor. x. 10) and his eyesight was probably weak,\* but it is difficult to believe that he was the victim of a serious complaint. If this was so, it is impossible to explain how he was able to endure hardships which would have undermined any but the most robust constitution (2 Cor. xi. 23-28).

Moreover, St. Paul's own description of the "thorn" in 2 Cor. 12 does not suggest a bodily ailment. He says that in order that his visions should not make him over-exultant he was given "a thorn (or stake) in the flesh," "a messenger of Satan to buffet him." The most natural view is that the angel of Satan came to tempt the Apostle. The Devil's chief occupation seems to be the temptation of mankind, and what is liable to make a man less exultant than a temptation he is always struggling to master?

The use of the word flesh (*sarx*) by no means proves that the phrase describes a bodily affliction. St. Paul frequently used *sarx* to denote the lower side of human nature, and when he said, "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18), he was perhaps thinking of the thorn in the flesh. And no one can read St. Paul's epistles without realizing that he was excessively conscious of fleshly sins. Thus interpreted, the phrase "thorn in the flesh" suggests that the Apostle's virile temperament was a source of special temptation to him.

\* Cf. Acts ix. 9 and xxiii. 5, and Gal. vi. 11.



This agrees with what we know of his life. At times his indignation ran away with him. He quarrelled with St. Mark and with St. Peter. His epistles are full of passionate outbursts, some of which he must have regretted afterwards. It appears that some awkward incident accompanied his first visit to Galatia.

His reference to this is most significant. He speaks of his "infirmity in the flesh" (which caused him to go to Galatia) as a temptation (Gal. iv. 13-14). The passage runs:

"But ye know that because of an infirmity in the flesh I preached the gospel unto you the first time: and that which was a temptation to you in my flesh ye despised not nor rejected. . . ."

In the A.V. the latter section reads: "And my temptation which was in the flesh ye despised not nor rejected."

It is generally assumed that the infirmity in the flesh which caused St. Paul to go to Galatia was an illness, but in the only other context in which he uses the phrase *astheneia tes sarkos*, it refers to moral and not to physical weakness. For in writing to the Romans he says: "I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye presented your members as servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity, even so now present your members as servants to righteousness unto sanctification" (Rom. vi. 19).

This suggests that the infirmity in the flesh which brought about the Galatian visit was a fit of anger in which St. Paul gave way to his old temptation. If we examine the passage Acts xiii. 13 and xv. 37-40, we find a striking confirmation of this view. The visit to Galatia was immediately preceded by the quarrel with St. Mark. If it was a difference of opinion with St. Mark that caused St. Paul to change his plans, we have a satisfactory explanation of the whole situation.

Gal. iv. 14 suggests that the "thorn" continued to give trouble after he arrived in Galatia. If it is true that he went there for a cure it seems to have been in vain! On the other hand, we know for a certainty that he did give way to anger on his first visit to Galatia. At least, we cannot doubt that his turning to the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 46) was accompanied by an outburst of indignation. And far from shewing resentment, we know that the Galatian Gentiles received St. Paul as an angel of light (Gal. iv. 14; cf. Acts xiii. 48).

Finally, if we take the view that the thorn in the flesh was not an illness but the temptations that were inevitable to a man of St. Paul's temperament, we shall find it easier to understand why God refused to "cure" him.

He tells us that he besought the Lord thrice concerning this thing (the thorn), that it might depart from him (2 Cor. xii. 8). Now if it was an illness which was hampering St. Paul's work, it is impossible to account for God's unwillingness to heal him. But if it was a temptation it is easy to understand God's reluctance to remove it.\* God could only have banished the temptation by altering St. Paul's whole character and make-up. Such a course would not only have involved treating the Apostle as a puppet or a machine, but would have deprived the world of one of the greatest characters it has ever seen.

V. A. HOLMES-GORE.

\* The Lord's rejoinder, "My grace is sufficient for thee," suggests that the thorn was a temptation which could only be overcome by God's grace.



# CARDINAL NEWMAN ON BISHOP BUTLER: AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER

NEWMAN'S veneration for Butler as evidenced in his *Tracts for the Times*, in his *Apologia pro vita sua*, and in his general correspondence, is not entirely unknown, though frequently neglected by students of nineteenth-century religious thought. In this connection, reference is sometimes made to Newman's accolade of Butler as "the greatest name in the Anglican Church." The letter containing this observation has never, I think, been published. Through the courtesy of the Provost and the Fellows of Oriel College, Oxford, it is my privilege to bring it to light. The occasion of its writing was the centenary of Butler's death, which called forth from Edward Steere *Some Remains (Hitherto Unpublished) of Joseph Butler*. Newman's letter, addressed to Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, needs no further introduction.

EDGBASTON,  
BIRMINGHAM.

December 5, 1852.

DEAR MR. PROVOST,

A letter I have received from a stranger this morning, with a few pages of *Remains of Joseph Butler*, reminds me that I have what looks like an autograph letter of his.

I enclose it, and would beg the College's acceptance of it, provided you are making, or have made, any collection of his remains. I think I am right in supposing you have some memorandum books of his already. Oriel has a claim on whatever can be found of such memorials of her special boast, the greatest name in the Anglican Church.

If, however, it would be merely a troublesome charge for the College to have the custody of it, may I beg of your kindness to determine its destination?

I am taking for granted that the letter is genuine, which of course has to be decided.

I am going to overlook asking your acceptance of a volume which I am on the point of publishing on University Education. There are things in it which will pain you, but I think, or trust, there are more which will give you pleasure.

I am, my dear Mr. Provost,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—My direction in a few days will be "Abbotsford, Melrose."

Newman's gift was Butler's eighth letter to Dr. Samuel Clarke, dated "Oriel, Oct. 3 [1717]." Comparison with the handwriting of Butler MSS. at the Bodleian established the letter as authentic, and it was therefore accepted by Dr. Hawkins. In the library at Oriel it may be seen in a show-case, together with the two notebooks that Newman had referred to. Newman's covering letter, here printed, is not included in the display.

ERNEST CAMPBELL MOSSNER  
(College of the City of New York).



## NOTES ON PERIODICALS

*Jewish Quarterly Review.* Vol. xxvi., No. 2. October, 1935.

Professor Israel Davidson calls attention to some interesting researches in Mediæval Hebrew Poetry: the complete *Diwan* of Samuel ha-Nagid (born Cordova, 993; died Granada, 1055), one of the greatest of Hebrew poets; the *Diwan* of Tadros ben Jehudah (1247-1306), which had disappeared for six centuries; and Dr. Solis-Cohen's translation of selected poems of Moses Ibn Ezra (born 1070 at Granada, died first half of twelfth century). How appropriate today, in the mouths of many an exile and a sufferer whose only sin against the German state is that they are members of the great Hebrew race, is the lament of this singer in Israel:

"How long yet must my feet, at Fate's behest,  
The path of exile tread, and find no rest?  
The sword of Separation hath he drawn  
To harry me over the earth;  
And with the battle-axe of Wandering,  
From each new refuge doth he drive me forth,  
Upon me he hath loosed his brood of ills;  
I totter, yea, I fall, before their might—  
Whilst, like a fading shadow, day by day  
My life takes flight."

Dr. H. M. Orlinsky contributes a useful note on some corruptions in the Greek Text of Job and Professor Samuel S. Cohon discusses D. A. Schlatter's recent book on Josephus; in so doing he makes the following observations: Josephus was silent regarding Christian origins for the same reason that he glossed over other divisions in Jewry, for Christianity had sprung from the heart of Judaism. "Even if Christianity had grown sufficiently important for the aristocratic historian to take notice of its development, he may have desisted in order not to accentuate the divisions, and thereby spoil the picture of Jewish unity which he endeavours to paint."

Professor Joseph Reider, continuing his valuable survey of Biblical literature, tells of the increasing number of German scholars who are in revolt against the Wellhausen theory of Old Testament criticism. Their statements are often highly dogmatic and require a considerable amount of testing and sifting. It is surprising to find that Reider himself believes the source of E has been shaken to the foundation, and that it may be only a question of time when "the entire structure of the Pentateuchal hypothesis will collapse."

R. D. MIDDLETON.



## REVIEWS

### II. CORINTHIANS (THE MOFFATT NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY). By R. H. Strachan, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

I must admit that I do not really like Moffatt's translation of the New Testament. On the other hand, the series of Commentaries, so far as I have seen them, are admirable; and Dr. Strachan on 2 Corinthians strikes me as very good indeed. It is really scholarly, and yet it succeeds in bringing out the religious values of this very difficult Epistle, without lapsing into homiletic piety in order to get out of a difficulty. I will begin with a few criticisms. I cannot really believe that the section vi. 14-vii. 1 is a fragment of an earlier Pauline letter misplaced here, for the simple reason that I doubt if the ancients were well enough equipped in the matter of scissors and paste to be able to make so neat an insertion of an isolated fragment; while the section, though it breaks an otherwise straightforward train of thought, does not strike me as impossibly irrelevant—for a Pauline digression. On the other hand, the putting together of an earlier Epistle and a later, with the beginning of one and the end of the other cut out, and the arrangement of the two in their wrong order is eminently possible, and I have no doubt that Moffatt is right in printing x. 1-xiii. 10 at the beginning as part of the earlier and "severe" letter; Dr. Strachan explains the merits of this arrangement and the impossibility of the received order with admirable cogency and clarity. But to return to my criticisms. In iv. 10 Moffatt translates, "Wherever I go, I am being killed in the body as Jesus was," a paraphrase of, "Always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus," which Dr. Strachan defends as "both necessary and adequate." I cannot agree; it seems to me an intolerable evasion of the difficult, but quite central, Pauline conception of his own life and ministry as a continuation of the earthly life of Jesus in which the Lord, in the person of His disciple, completes the work which He began in His own person. To water the phrase down to the language of late nineteenth-century liberalism is quite unjustifiable, even if we think that late nineteenth-century liberalism was the last word in Christian theology, though as a matter of fact Dr. Strachan does not fall into any such mistake. Thus on p. 121 he writes that "not merely the Pauline, but the whole New Testament conception of the relation of Christ to human sin must remain unintelligible, and even repulsive to those who take an ultimately humanistic



view of the person of Jesus," an admirable saying. And to finish the ungrateful task of criticism, I feel there should have been some attempt to assess the extent, if any, to which St. Paul embodies in this Epistle views of the soul drawn from Iranian sources; for this letter is one of the chief documents by which the theories of the Reitzenstein school must stand or fall.

But the commentary as a whole is deserving of the highest praise. In particular it recognizes the dangers of St. Paul's own position, and the amount that his Jewish opponents had on their side; his treatment of v. 16, "knowing Christ after the flesh," rightly sees that Paulinism stood for faith in the risen and exalted Lord, rather than in the imitation of the example of the "Jesus of history," and rightly recognizes that this attitude would have been fatal to Christianity apart from the opposite tendency of thought in the early Church which led to the production of the synoptic Gospels. I do not remember seeing this passage so boldly treated in any other commentary on the Epistle.

Again, Dr. Strachan is brilliant in his application of St. Paul's teaching to modern conditions and to the modern way of looking at things. What could be a better commentary on St. Paul's statement that Satan's ministers masquerade as ministers of righteousness than this: "A man may either defend orthodoxy or promote liberal views within the Church. In either case his dominant motive, hidden from himself, may be a love of power, or concern for a party which is an expression 'of his larger self.' The result will be the rise of a spirit in the Church alien to Christ's spirit."

I should like to quote more from Dr. Strachan. I can only recommend him to those who are engaged in the teaching and exposition of the Scriptures as the best guide I know.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

---

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL TRADITION. By Reginald Tribe, S.S.M. 1935. Pp. 293. S.P.C.K. Paper, 3s. 6d. Cloth, 5s.

Father Tribe has given us a useful book, which was much needed: a Primer of Christian Sociology, meant to provide material for Study Circles, etc. It is divided into three parts. Part I., Historical, gives a survey of the teaching of Jesus Christ, of the Church of the Fathers, the Middle Ages, and the social tradition of Israel; Part II. deals with the theological basis of Christian Sociology; Part III., with Politics, Economics, the Family, Education, Leisure, Internationalism, and our present task. It is well set up; there are no misprints; and



only one mistake—on p. 28, line 10, where a "no" seems to be required to read "there can be *no* doubt."

In a survey of such a vast subject it is obvious that a selection must be made; and it has been made wisely: and, on the whole, with exceptions to be noted later on, each problem has been fairly stated. The aim of the book may be expressed as an effort to restore that unity to the life of man which was lost at the Reformation—*e.g.*, p. 33: "... St. Paul's social teaching, like his master's, is not separated from the rest of his teaching on Christian morals; it is an essential part of the general Christian ethos. And the ethos depends on the faith believed. His primary consideration is that the redeemed form a new family, and that therefore the community spirit and family love are essentials of this new body."

The chapter on the Teaching of Jesus Christ is admirable in its balance and sound judgment. But the treatment of the catastrophic and apocalyptic element in His teaching (p. 24) is unconvincing, and should be supplemented by reading Conrad Noel's essay on "Jesus" in *Christianity and the Social Revolution*. This lack of the revolutionary spirit is felt throughout the book.

In the chapter on the Church of the Fathers undue emphasis is laid on the *exclusive* nature of Christian charity (p. 39), "practically the whole limited to the care of those within the Church only." It is impossible thus to ignore the fact that Julian the Apostate wrote to Arsacius: "These godless Galileans feed not only their own poor but ours; our poor lack our care." So it was with the sick during plagues, and with the burial of the dead (Harnack's *Miss. and Exp. of Christianity*, Vol. I., pp. 162, 171).

In the chapter on the Middle Ages, Father Tribe tries to shew that "the Middle Ages were permeated by this sense of justice." But his purpose is scarcely served by this passage on the Statute of Labourers, p. 66: "The Act would never have become law without the backing of the common sentiment that exploitation of a situation by a class to its own advantage was against all Christian usage." This Statute, passed by a Parliament of landlords, who, with the "justices of the labourers," are described by Hasbach as "a kind of employers' association," completely failed. Attempts to enforce it were made in 1360, with branding on the forehead for fugitive labourers; again in 1368 and 1388. Lipton says: "On the whole, then, the Statute of Labourers must be regarded as a one-sided piece of legislation, an unfair exercise of political power in the interest of a single class of the community." Green writes: "To enforce such a law literally must have been impossible, for corn rose to so high a price that a day's labour at the old wages would not have



purchased wheat enough for a man's support. But the land-owners did not shrink from the attempt." Stubbs, after describing the Black Death, writes: "... but worse than pestilence was the Statute of Labourers . . . (which) offered the labourers wages that it was worse than slavery to accept." They can scarcely be accused of "exploiting" the situation! By 1497 labour has become a commodity (Hasbach). There are signs throughout the book under review that insufficient attention has been given to the two vital transitions by which both "labour-force" and "money" became commodities to be bought and sold. They are vital to the economics of today, when we live under the rule of international bankers and other moneylenders. Is it true to say that "the practice of the just price ceased with the end of the Middle Ages"? (p. 75.) The co-operative method of distribution seems to have solved it to the satisfaction of one-fourth of the population in England and elsewhere. The treatment of interest and usury seems inadequate. If it "is impossible to fix a just rate of interest" (p. 209), we can at least say what is an unjust rate. Our Law Courts are doing so every day. In the chapter on Economics sufficient information has not been given on the change effected by the Limited Liability clauses of the "Companies Act" of 1862; and to the formation of "rings," "trusts," and "cartels," which have given to international financiers a strangle-hold on industry. The battle for economic freedom has to be fought against an immensely powerful combination of international moneylenders (bankers and investors, etc.) with the lords of the key-industries, oil, coal, armament firms, iron, steel, chemicals, and cotton, knit together by interlocked directorates, and holding "a controlling share" (51 per cent.) in many thousands of companies. It is scarcely true to say that we are not dealing with a "system" (p. 226). It was by defying this system that Father Basil Jellicoe was able to start England on abolishing its slums. A more generous estimate should have been given of the work of the Trades Unions, which have done more than the Church to protect the poor against their oppressors. Mention should have been made of the two most Christian efforts, which, though at present unsuccessful, will probably dominate the future: The plan of "differential rents" as worked by Father Jenkinson in Leeds; and the Valder plan of company formation, at work in New Zealand, by which "interest" is assured, usury is impossible, and, by "no-par-value" shares, the whole profits of a company are justly divided among those who contribute "service." The three chapters with which the book ends are quite admirable.

As there is no index, and some subjects are treated in several



widely separated places, students would be helped if "captions" headed each section. The book-list would be strengthened by adding *Wanted! A Practical Solution to Britain's Industrial Problem*, by H. Valder (Mowbray), *The Re-building of Rural England*, by M. Fordham, and *The Christian Ethic as an Economic Factor*, by Sir J. Stamp.

Father Tribe has fulfilled his purpose at a high level; covering a vast field without losing balance and proportion, and giving guidance with sound judgment. The book will be a valuable guide to the first studies of those whose conscience has awakened to their Christian duty in these matters; and the Church should be grateful to the S.P.C.K. for publishing so useful a book at such a reasonable price and so well produced.

PAUL B. BULL, C.R.

---

DISPENSATIONS. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. S.P.C.K.  
8s. 6d.

This is a timely "compilation," as the writer modestly calls it, published by a well-known Church Society, under the auspices of the Church Union. Timely: because "we are not, as a Church, widely familiar with the principles on which the practice of granting Dispensations should be based." And modest: because, while the writer disclaims authorship, no man in the English Church is better qualified than he to offer us guidance, based on sound learning and sustained impartiality, on a subject which is, at present, no less important than perplexing.

After a brief notice of the chief writers on Dispensations he traces the development of the theory of Dispensations, from Tertullian to Suarez: and perhaps the most fruitful account of a Dispensation is, as we might expect, that which Dr. Simpson quotes from St. Leo: "As there are certain things which can in no wise be controverted, so there are many things which require to be modified, either by considerations of age or by the necessities of the case; always provided that we remember, in things which are doubtful or obscure, that that must be followed which is found to be neither contrary to the commands of the Gospel nor opposed to the decrees of the holy Fathers" (*Ep. clxvii. §. 3*): and St. Leo proceeds to deal with the questions submitted to him in the light of this principle. Here is involved the question, With whom lies the authority to dispense, Bishop or Pope? And, in a notable chapter on the History of Dispensations, the conclusion is reached that, while in the Roman Church "the dispensing function [of a bishop] is subject to peculiar restraint," in England, owing to the privilege of the Lower House of Convocation to concur or not to concur with



the resolutions of the Upper House, the authority of the episcopate, and *a fortiori* of the diocesan bishop, to dispense, is also limited. In short, the dispensing authority has to remember the maxim laid down by a seventh-century pope, "We are defenders of the sacred canons and guardians of the same, not transgressors." It would be interesting to know what those in England or in India, who *ex officio* ought to be "guardians," have to say for themselves when, for instance, they claim to be able to dispense from Canon XXXVI. of 1604 (as revised in 1865) and permit "a preacher, who rejected the Ordinal and was outside the Anglican fellowship, to preach within its assemblies for worship"; or again when, in India, the Synod of the Province after enacting that "to no person except a Bishop or a Priest is it committed or allowed to celebrate the Holy Eucharist" (*Constitution of the Church of India*, p. 16) they can contemplate any exception to the rule here asserted, on the part of any bishop "by the occasional use of his power of dispensation" (*ibid.*, p. 15). Nor is this rule an exclusively Anglican rule. "Neither Roman nor Greek Catholic," says Dr. Simpson, "would allow that this is a case which admits of Dispensation. If the English Church were to grant such Dispensations, the act would necessarily have an estranging and dividing effect on its relation to the other great Episcopal Communion of the world" (p. 195).

Returning to the sequence of Dr. Simpson's chapters, lest his book should be ignored as simply a *livre d'occasion*, it may be noted that the author passes on to consider the persons and the matters subject to dispensation—Clergy and Religious in cc. iii.-iv., and Marriage in cc. v.-vii. On the latter subject, his accurate yet detailed history is of the greatest moment at the present time in view of the *Report on the Church and Marriage* (S.P.C.K., 1935, 1s. net).

The later chapters, viii.-xiv., pass on to consider Dispensations in the English Church since the Reformation. Here more than once it is pointed out that, if we are as a self-respecting society to recover an equitable and orderly system of Dispensations, we must first of all know what the law is from which it is proposed to dispense. The Western Canon Law in England was thrown into confusion by the *Submission of the Clergy*, 1532 (see it in Gee and Hardy, *Documents illustrative of English Church History*, No. XLVIII.). By this document, the clergy submitted previous canons to a committee of revision, on condition that those approved should be put into force. The revision was never accomplished: and it is still a matter of great complexity to know what parts of the Western Canon Law are still in force, and what are abrogated as being contrary to "the laws of the



realm." We need, therefore, a revision and codification of the Canon Law for the English Church such as has been effected in the new *Codex Juris Canonici* for the Roman Catholic Church. At present, "in the English Church, where the regulating influence of the Canon Law is rendered insecure by the uncertainties and controversial questions surrounding it," a proper system of Dispensations is hardly conceivable. We are thrown back, for most purposes, on the individual Bishop: and he on little else but his own judgment. Meanwhile, such principles as elsewhere and at other times have governed the practice of Dispensation can best be ascertained from Dr. Simpson's final chapter on "Conclusions"; and this no parish priest, and most of all no bishop, can afford to neglect.

B. J. KIDD.



## NOTICES

**THE CATHOLIC REGENERATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.** By Paula Schaefer. Translated from the German by Ethel Talbot Scheffauer. Williams and Norgate. 10s. 6d.

Much interest is added to this book by the author's personal experiences. Her surroundings were Protestant. She studied theology at Marburg, is indebted to Heiler's influence, and is a contributor to his Journal *Eine heilige Kirche*. She became convinced that the New Testament is a Catholic document, but was unable to accept Catholicism of the Roman type. She lost her position as teacher in an Evangelical school through being considered Catholic-minded, and never got any place again. She visited England, and found in the English Church her spiritual home.

Her object in writing this book was to shew her dear German people how a Church can be really Catholic and really national at once, really Evangelical in the sense of the Holy Scriptures, and also possessing the full Catholic Sacraments. She lived awhile in England, studied in the Bodleian, and is familiar with a wide range of Anglican literature.

The Revival in the nineteenth century is considered in three stages: Tractarianism, Puseyism, Ritualism. An admirably realistic account is given of how the Tracts for the Times came to be composed. "The old leaders remained solidly and steadfastly planted in Anglicanism, the young strove on beyond this." "Rome worked like a magnet upon the spirits of these impressionable young men, who could not hold the Anglican frontier line, and therefore were not proof against the attacks which were now levelled against them by authoritative personalities in the University." The Tractarian party was "scattered, lost, silenced." So we pass to Puseyism and the battle for Doctrine. Here the work is much less clear. In the period of Ritualism the author is more at home. Considerable skill is shewn in selecting telling incidents. Effective contrasts are drawn between the appearance of English Churches before the Revival and since. Liddon is represented "in his London Church," and Acton's estimate of his influence is appreciated.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the author's estimate of the character of Modern Anglicanism in the twentieth century. The outcome of the Revival has tended towards "a determination of boundaries": namely, Reunion, Reservation and Revision. The author admires Dr. Temple's reflections on the Genius of the Church of England. "This shews the English Church as the guardian of both Catholic and Evangelical traditions, and yet generously acknowledges her failings and weaknesses." Negotiations with Rome have so far shewn the smallest positive results. The author has it on the authority of Dr. Heiler that Leo XIII. was already on the point of composing an address of welcome to the homecoming Anglican Bishops when Cardinal Vaughan hurried to Rome. With regard to Revision, the author thinks that the refusal of the House of Commons to pass it is no misfortune, but rather a gain; the result "is considerably more favourable (to freedom) than if the new Prayer Book had been accepted by Parliament and so become law." The significance of the alteration made in the Revised Consecration Prayer, inserting an



invocation of the Spirit to consecrate after the Words of Christ have been recited, is critically weighed. "If the Epiclesis had been set in before the Sacramental Words, all would have been in order; but as it has been put afterwards it is actually a contradiction."

It is a difficult problem, she says, to house so many different elements safely under one roof. Sensational conversions to Rome from the ranks of zealous Anglo-Catholics are not infrequent. A number of them return. "A nun told the author recently that a priest of her acquaintance had received thirty persons at once back into the Anglican Church, but all had begged him to let no one hear of their spiritual adventure." Nevertheless she is convinced that "it is the duty of Anglicanism to keep a firm hand on itself when confronted with such developments as those in the extreme Catholic wing."

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

---

THE SACRAMENTS AND THE CHURCH. By Henry de Candole. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

An urgent need of today is a clearer grasp by the rank and file of the corporate nature of Christianity. Much has been written on this subject, but it has not yet "got across." How is the doctrine of the Family to be made real to the ordinary Christian? Father de Candole, writing out of "actual experience in a Tyneside parish," works out its practical implications, and especially its bearing upon sacramental teaching and practice. His chapters on Penance and the Eucharist are really excellent. Specially valuable is the discussion of the problems surrounding the two-fold ideal of weekly Sung Mass and general Communion. Many of the topics touched upon are necessarily controversial; but the tone is wholly admirable, and there is a loyal reference throughout to the teaching of the Prayer Book. We heartily recommend this book to priests who wish to bring home to their people the corporate nature of the Christian life and to lead them to a better understanding and use of the sacraments.

C. MILLINGTON, C.R.

---

LES DOMINICAINES. By M.-M. Davy. ("Les Grands Ordres Monastiques," xviii.) Grasset. Paris, 1935. Pp. 268. 15 frs.

A brief account in most elegant French of the Dominican Nuns. The contemplative nuns of the second order are actually older in regular foundation than the friars. The various congregations of third order nuns are less well known, and are remarkable for their variety, contemplative, nursing, educational, catechist, missionary, etc. The latest, the Convent of the Rue S. Jacques, is developing higher education and the intellectual apostolate for women. Perhaps the most touching work is the congregation of the *réhabilitées de Béthanie*, in whose houses penitents, after probation, enter the choir without distinction beside their virgin sisters, Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala at the foot of the Cross together. Two preliminary chapters on the spiritual teaching of SS. Dominic and Catherine of Siena do really illuminate the spirit of the Institutes subsequently described.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.



FRIENDS OF GOD: PRACTICAL MYSTICS OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

By Anna G. Seesholtz. Columbia University Press. H. Milford.  
12s. 6d.

This is in intention an entirely sympathetic study of the fourteenth-century German mystical school of Eckhart, Tauler, Ruysbroek, etc., and their background. It brings out clearly an important stage of the movement which eventually issued in the over-individualistic piety of the counter-Reformation from which Catholic spirituality is now in process of returning to a more balanced conception. As such the book is valuable. The available literature, mediæval and modern, has been ransacked with admirable industry if not always with discrimination. But the authoress writes of her subject with a distressing sentimentality and always entirely from the outside. To sum up the achievement of the Mystics (*e.g.*, a man like Suso!) as "a great measure of integration of self and sense of direction and joy in life" reveals a lack of understanding so complete as to present a caricature, though the statement is no doubt true so far as it goes. What the Mystics sought and found is *God*. All else is nothing beside that. But the writer nowhere appears to grasp the fact that the whole purpose of the Catholic Religion in its most popular as well as its most mystical manifestations is simply the union of the soul with God. Probably only those who have themselves experienced year in, year out, the hourly pressure of obedience and conventual discipline, and the daily and hourly saturation of the soul with the *anima ecclesiæ* in the traditional office and liturgy, are likely fully to understand the spirit of religious like Tauler and Ruysbroek. These things mould the soul. For the appreciation of Dominican Mystics especially the Thomist Philosophy and Theology which form the staple of their intellectual training are essential, but they are not here mentioned. Only those who have some personal share, however inadequate, in the Catholic experience, which the Mystics receive in its most intense form, can hope to avoid a measure of misrepresentation of their thought, and the authoress evidently suffers from this lack of personal understanding. Nevertheless as a repertory of not very accessible facts concerning the personal history of the Mystics the book has considerable usefulness.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

PROGRESS THROUGH MENTAL PRAYER. By Edward Leen. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Leen has no need to apologize for giving his readers another book on prayer and how to pray. There seems an earnest desire among people to learn the secret of prayer, and the number of books produced on the subject is witness to this fact and a sincere desire to meet the need.

Dr. Leen writes refreshingly on the subject, and those who have been taught by him must be glad to have his teaching so clearly put before them. He follows the traditional method laid down by the saints. He does not claim any originality in the matter, but we are intensely grateful to him for insisting on a knowledge of the life of the Lord as given in Scripture as the true foundation to mental prayer. On p. 215 he says, "The Gospel is the textbook of sanctity," and on p. 25 *seq.* he gives an example of how to read the Gospel. It is a reverent familiarity with the sacred text that opens the door of spiritual progress. Many of the good things in this book are found in the footnotes giving quotations from the saints.

W. E. LUTYENS.



A LITTLE BOOK OF RELIGIOUS VERSE. By G. Lacey May. S.P.C.K. 2s.

This is a small book, but none the less worthy on that account. The people of Easton are to be congratulated on having one for their parish priest who can take the poetry of the past and shew some of its good things to them. It is to be regretted that copyright has stood in his way as to more modern work, but his selection from what was available is good. It is well arranged and should not only be found useful, but an incentive to his readers to search out things for themselves and so add to the richness of their devotions.

W. E. LUTYENS.

THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST. By Fulton Sheen. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

There seem to be three fundamental doctrines on which the complete edifice of Christian truth is built: the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of the Incarnation, and the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. These are the three lamps in the sanctuary, necessary to the worship of God. Students of religious history can find instance after instance of times when lack of grasp on one of these beliefs has meant lowered vitality in the whole body of Faith. They form a kind of Trinity among themselves, and through them we know God as He was and is and ever shall be.

Obviously the conception of the Mystical Body of Christ is the one which is vaguest to the contemporary Christian consciousness today. Too often the average Englishman's idea of the Church might be summed up in such words as "Oh, well, I suppose you mean the Roman Catholic Church; but how can anybody be expected to believe in the Pope and relics and indulgences and all that sort of thing, nowadays?" Or am I wrong? Have we restored not only the conception of the Church as the guardian of orthodox doctrine, and as a visible organization with a Divine Founder; but also the conception of the Church as a living organism, the prolongation on earth of the life of Christ?

Dr. Sheen has written an eloquent and a learned book. He is a Roman of the Romans, and returns several times to the defence of the proposition *Ubi Petrus ibi ecclesia*. He has evidently visited the Vatican and received the Holy Father's blessing, and writes still under the influence of the powerful emotion that the experience evoked. His book is beautiful and deeply felt, none the less personal for the fact that the word "I" seldom appears.

The bravest chapter is the one headed *Scandals*, for in it Dr. Sheen is content to accept many weaknesses of the Church on its human side which other less courageous defenders have denied. We remember how unwisely Father Hugh Benson upheld the Inquisition, and how injudiciously Newman exasperated Kingsley by declaring that a lying, drunken Irish-woman was superior to any number of Protestant divines by the mere fact of her attendance at Mass; and rejoice that Dr. Sheen finds better weapons than indiscriminating zeal. Many people would lay aside half their prejudices against the Roman Catholic Church if they found her capable of self-criticism.

There is always a heartache, though, for readers of such a book, who cannot agree with all its claims. Dr. Sheen's mind is obviously closed to the possibility of the Mystical Body being knit into one except by way of complete submission to Rome. Is there indeed no other road? Some men pin their hopes to a succession of conferences—but these certainly will be of little use if delegates meet together, each one hoping to impose



a sectional point of view on the rest, and to gain a victory at other people's expense. But if the Churches could meet and acknowledge their sins; if the Eastern Churches would confess to formalism and deadness; Rome to arrogance and political ambitions; Protestant bodies to reliance on human knowledge; the Church of England (but I am on dangerous ground here) to confusion and insularity; if the solemn conclave began with the *Miserere*—might not there be some hope?

"*Tibi soli peccavi et malum coram te feci; ut justificeris in sermonibus tuis . . .*" "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise . . ." "Build *Thou* the walls of Jerusalem." ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

DARIUS THE MEDE AND THE FOUR WORLD EMPIRES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL. By H. H. Rowley. University of Wales. Press Board. 12s. 6d.

When a book of only 182 pages is prefaced by 23 closely printed pages of "works consulted," one expects that it will be about something important and fears that it will be dull. Whether the Book of Daniel is worth all the laborious scholarship that has been devoted to it or not may be questioned. Professor Rowley has mastered the literature, and by isolating two main problems has produced a book that is only dull when he is summarizing a host of critical opinions, his own work being lucid and interesting.

Scholars are still discussing whether the Book of Daniel is a unity or not, and if not, whether it is to be divided after chap. vi. or after chap. vii. Rowley strongly inclines to regard the book as a unity, but records a wide variety of views as to the relative age of the different parts held by those who divide the book. One fears that in time critical scholarship will bury itself under its own accumulations.

Professor Rowley seeks to elucidate two problems: Did Darius the Mede ever exist? and, Which were the Four World Empires of chaps. ii. and vii.? The former problem looks capable of easy solution, yet recent scholarship has propounded such various theories as that Darius the Mede never existed, or that he was Nabonidus, or Neriglissar, or Cambyses, or Cyaxares II., or Gobryas, or Astyages. The World Empires, again, are variously identified. Those who hold them to be really Empires all begin with the Babylonian, but differ about the other three. Those who hold them to be individual monarchs begin with Nebuchadnezzar and differ about the rest.

Some of the proposed identifications of Darius are now known to be impossible. The most plausible (with Cambyses) involves (on the Biblical data) the absurdities that Cyrus was Ahasuerus, that he was at least about eighty when he conquered Babylon, that his son was called "the Mede," and that Darius' chief officer of state, Daniel, always referred to him by a throne-name different from that which he otherwise bore.

Professor Rowley cites fifteen modern scholars as identifying Darius with Gobryas, but says that "closer examination soon shews that it cannot be maintained." Then why do these scholars try to maintain it? Rowley's demolition of the theory, and of the rest, seems so convincing that one wonders whether a reputation for ingenuity, and not search for truth, is not the real goal of some modern scholarship.

Rowley's own view is that the author of Daniel has confused the Fall of Babylon brought about in 520 by Darius Hystaspis with the Fall brought about in 538 by Cyrus; that the age assigned to Darius (v. 31) was really



that of Cyrus; and that Darius is called "the Mede" because prophecy had foretold that Babylon would fall to the Medes (Jer. li. 11, 28; Is. xiii. 17). Rowley asserts that "The claim of the Book of Daniel to be a work of history, written by a well-informed contemporary, is shattered beyond repair by this fiction of Darius the Mede" (pp. 59-60), so this Darius, unlike Belshazzar, has not yet become a figure of real history.

In dealing with the identity of the Four Kingdoms Rowley concentrates chiefly on the proof that the Fourth Kingdom is the Greek (as far as Antiochus Epiphanes). This is the oldest interpretation, but has gained a new significance by the use made of it by those who minimize the predictive element in prophecy, for if the more traditional view, that the Fourth Kingdom is the Roman, be right, here is long-distance prediction. Rowley argues the matter independently of this consideration. To read his summary of the amazing variety of the "Roman" interpretations is to wonder why Christianity should have been so plagued by cranks. Against those who hold that "the whole structure of the Christian faith rests on the case for the sixth-century origin of this book" Rowley says, "A God who buried His meaning so securely that the pious of all ages, including many of the most honoured and consecrated, as well as the most learned, men of all Christian history, have failed to find it, and have differed by 2,000 years and more in their identification of the climax of the visions, would but rob His revelation of all worth. Instead of unfolding future events, He would be but veiling them, and that is not revelation, but its antithesis" (p. 179). His closing pages demonstrate finely the religious gain that comes from the view that Daniel was written in the "burning, fiery furnace" of the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes.

A. E. MORRIS.

---

THE FAITH AND THE AGE. By Bede Frost. Catholic Literature Association. 3s. 6d.

These six lectures are a useful attempt to state the fundamentals of the Catholic Faith in relation to modern thought. Each lecture has a list of books for further study.

The author makes one bad blunder. In his chapter on Man, his Nature and End, he states that the Faith tells us that the purpose of man is to know, love and serve God. St. Augustine gives us the true Catholic definition: "The end of man's creation is that we might find peace in the full fruition and the love and worship of God and our brethren in the same God" (*De Civitate Dei*, Bk. XIX., chap. xiii.). St. Thomas, too, in discussing "whether it is more meritorious to love one's neighbour than to love God," states that the comparison is stated falsely; that the true one is: "Hence the comparison will be between perfect love of God extending also to our neighbour, and an inadequate and imperfect love of God, for this commandment we have from God, that he who loveth God love also his brother (1 John iv. 21) (*Summa*, Part II.-II., No. 1, Q. 27, Art. 8).

G. KEABLE.

---

### BOOK NOTES

*Watchman, What of the Night?* Mowbray. 1s. A moving anonymous plea for the restoration of the contemplative life in an enclosed order of men.



*Is it a Sin?* By D. Morse-Boycott. Phillip Allan. 2s. 6d. The rest of the title is: "Who Herein with Wit and Wisdom unravels many a Problem of Conscience tormenting the Honest-to-Goodness Sinner." As the author has provided a review no further description appears to be necessary.

*Children of the Church.* By P. B. Thorburn. Skeffington. 3s. 6d. Twenty addresses to children.

*In Other Men's Shoes.* By Arthur Karney, D.D., Bishop of Southampton. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. Exceptionally vigorous and attractive sermons.

*Temples and Treasuries.* By Helen Wodehouse. Allen and Unwin. 5s. Lay sermons by the Mistress of Girton.

*The Building of Character.* By F. L. Underhill. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. Another of the Dean of Rochester's "little books," which—so well does he write them—make us grudge him the time he devotes to them which he might spend on more important works.

*Of the Imitation of Christ.* Illustrated by T. H. Robinson. Hutchinson. 15s. Whether the Imitation lends itself to illustration is a matter of opinion. If it was to be done at all, no happier choice could have been made than Mr. Robinson, whose firm lines and reverent treatment can give nothing but pleasure to the recipient of this gift book.

*The Faith of a Catholic.* By M. Donavan. Faith Press, Ltd. 2s. Father Donavan's Sermon Outlines have made him so well known to his fellow clergy that they will be glad to know of this full and inexpensive Manual of Instruction.

W. K. L. C.

*Highways and Hedges.* The Church's Call to Evangelism. Fifteen Sermons by Eminent Preachers. Skeffington. 5s. Books of Sermons with a real and sane Evangelical message are always a welcome addition to the religious literature of the day. This volume to which the Bishop of Leicester contributes a Foreword will be useful to many, so long as it is not a substitute for the priest's own reading and thinking.

R. D. M.

*The Inspiration of the Bible.* By R. H. Malden. Oxford University Press. 3s. 6d. The addresses by Dean Malden are marked by stimulus and suggestion. He examines the story of the Hebrews, the prophets and their work, the prophetic philosophy of history, and some Old Testament difficulties. The last two chapters deal with these difficulties, though we should have imagined that the congregation at Wells Cathedral would have risen above the matters indicated. The lecture we liked most in this book is the one that examines the prophetic philosophy of history. It is acute, and the classical and scientific background emphasizes this acuteness.

*The Life and Work of John Wycliffe.* By Dyson Hague. The Church Book Room. 3s. 6d. This is a second and enlarged edition of a book published twenty-six years ago, and it is written from the standpoint of an Evangelical who discerns in John Wyclif—this is the accepted spelling—a precursor of his own views in the distant fourteenth century. Many attitudes to the great reformer are possible, but we should have thought this attitude impossible. Nevertheless, we desire to state that in his new edition Dr. Hague employs the writings of Trevelyan, Coulton, and, above all, Workman, and he professes his acknowledgements of his debts to these historians.

R. H. M.